DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 520 JC 900 245

TITLE	The Structure of Public Postsecondary Education in Florida: Report and Recommendations of the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, 1990--Report 9. Prepared in response to Specific Appropriation 587 of the 1989 General Appropriations Act, Chapter 89-253, Laws of Florida.
INSTITUTION	Florida State Postsecondary Education Commission, Tallahassee.
PUB DATE	19 Apr 90
NOTE	84p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Planning; Community Colleges; Educational Assessment; Educational Development; *Educational Needs; Educational Objectives; Enrollment; Enrollment Trends; *Governance; Higher Education; Minority Groups; Population Trends; *Postsecondary Education; Public Colleges; State Surveys; State Universities; *Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Florida

ABSTRACT

In 1989, a study was conducted to examine the structure of public postsecondary education in Florida, focusing on the missions, locations, and capacity of existing institutions in light of projected population and enrollment trends over the next decade. Interviews were conducted with over 40 Florida education policy leaders, including staff and leaders from community colleges, public universities, and independent institutions. The study found that the capacities of postsecondary institutions were being strained by the state's rapidly growing population and demand for services. The following priority goals were identified: strengthen long range, statewide planning; improve undergraduate education; and improve the enrollment, retention, and graduation of the state's minority students. Specific recommendations included the following: (1) the existing structure for the governance and delivery of Florida's postsecondary education should be maintained; (2) planning processes of the state university and community colleges should occur within the framework of the Master Plan for Florida Postsecondary Education; (3) a statewide planning process should be developed for creating new postsecondary institutions; (4) joint-use university facilities involving a university presence on a community college campus should be located no more than one hour from a main university campus; (5) independent colleges and universities should be consulted in state planning for future postsecondary services; (6) Florida's two-plus-two system should be reinforced in all enrollment planning and policy development; (7) the impact of limited access programs on the ability of both native lower-division students and community college students to enter the upper division should be monitored; and (8) an evaluation and reward system should be developed to promote effective teaching. The bulk of the document is a consultant's report, "An Examination of the Overall Structure for the Delivery of Public Postsecondary Education in Florida," which is attached. Ten tables of data are appended. (WJT)

ED318520

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PLANNING COMMISSION

THE STRUCTURE OF PUBLIC POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION IN FLORIDA

Prepared in Response to Specific Appropriation 587
of the
1989 General Appropriations Act
Chapter 89-253, Laws of Florida

JC900245

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W.B. Proctor

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

1990 - Report 9

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

April 19, 1990

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....i

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

II. POSTSECONDARY GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES.....3

III. PUBLIC POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION IN FLORIDA.....5

The Evolution of State-Level Higher Education Governance in Florida
Florida's Postsecondary Structure: The Current Context
Demographic Pressures
A Coordination and Planning Imperative

IV. ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....12

Organizational Structure
Planning for Postsecondary Education
Undergraduate Education
Minority Participation
Conclusion

APPENDIX A Consultant's Report
APPENDIX B Consultant's Letter on Community College Governance and Vocational Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In proviso language accompanying Specific Appropriation 587 of the 1989 General Appropriations Act, the Florida Legislature provided funds for the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission to "examine the overall structure for the delivery of public postsecondary education in Florida. The study shall include an analysis of the missions, locations, and capacity of existing institutions in light of projected population and enrollment trends over the next ten years. The study shall include recommendations on any modifications to the current structure including acquisition or creation of new institutions or systems, consolidation of existing institutions, facility transfers or other necessary changes. A report shall be submitted to the Legislature and State Board of Education by March 1, 1990."

To direct this study, the Chairman of the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission appointed a Structure Committee consisting of Commission members Burke Kibler, Chairman, Robert Mautz, Alan Fickett, Robert Kerrigan, and Ralph Hogges to study the structure of postsecondary education in Florida and submit a full report to the Commission. The Structure Committee identified three preliminary issues to be addressed in the study: the effectiveness of the two state systems in providing governance and coordination for public higher education in Florida, the appropriateness of the current policies and procedures for establishing new campuses, centers and instructional sites, and the need for policies to guide a planned conversion of a joint-use facility into a separate college or university.

To facilitate the legislative charge, the Commission contracted with Augenblick, Van de Water & Associates (AVA) to conduct an extensive review of Florida's postsecondary education policy and planning documents as well as enrollment and demographic trends and projections. Augenblick, Van de Water and Associates invited three distinguished higher education policy experts, Patrick Callan, Senior Consultant for the Education Commission of the States, Vernon Crawford, Chancellor Emeritus, University System of Georgia, and Richard Richardson, Associate Director of the National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance, to serve as a review panel for the study.

During September and October, AVA conducted interviews with over 40 Florida education policy leaders, including Commission staff, legislative staff, State University System staff, community college staff, and a variety of campus leaders of the state's community colleges, public universities, and independent institutions. A preliminary consultant report was submitted in November, and served as the basis for testimony and discussion at public hearings that were held in December in Tallahassee, Orlando and Fort Lauderdale. In January, AVA presented their final report to the Structure Committee entitled "**An Examination of the Overall Structure For The Delivery Of Public Postsecondary Education in Florida.**" The report guided the Structure Committee in the development of its final report to the full Commission.

The Commission conducted a comprehensive review of the structure for the delivery of postsecondary education in Florida and found that the state's rapid growth, both in population and in demands for services, is taxing the

capacity of its postsecondary institutions. The preliminary report of the Commission's consultants recommended that certain state universities be assigned a primary mission of research, while others focus primarily on teaching as a means of addressing the future pressures to provide additional undergraduate opportunities and meet the research needs of the State. This type of structure, while viable in other states, was overwhelmingly rejected by those participating in the statewide public hearings held by the Commission.

Following a review of the Commission's consultant report and public testimony, the Commission does not recommend a major restructuring of postsecondary education in the State. The Commission has identified, however, the following priority goals to guide the development of postsecondary education in Florida in the 1990s: (1) strengthen long range, statewide planning, (2) improve undergraduate education, and (3) improve the enrollment, retention and graduation of the state's minority students.

The solutions to the state's problems in the delivery of postsecondary education should come from within the existing system and the established and recommended planning processes. The Commission recognizes the need for coordinated, farsighted and strategic planning among all of the state's postsecondary systems. The planning process of the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, the Board of Regents and the State Board of Community Colleges must be coordinated within a broad perspective of the state's delivery of postsecondary education. A statewide planning process is particularly needed to coordinate the development of new institutions and the modification of an existing institution's boundary or sphere of influence.

The Commission has provided ongoing support for the state's undergraduate enhancement programs and for the review of their outcomes. The most critical aspect of undergraduate education that has been identified to the Commission is the value of and need for quality college and university teaching. The Commission believes that effective teaching and other student-centered faculty activities need to be rewarded more generously in the faculty compensation system. Policies and procedures are needed at the state level, the institution level and the department level that increase both the prestige and compensation for outstanding teachers.

Through specific program and funding initiatives, the State has maintained a commitment during the last decade to increase minority access to postsecondary education throughout the State. Although progress has been made in the participation of minorities in the state's postsecondary institutions, the new decade will provide both a critical challenge and an opportunity to increase minority enrollments and improve minority graduation rates. To make a significant difference will require a commitment of resources, personnel, and programs in a clearly supportive campus environment.

Recommendations:

1. **The existing structure for the governance and the delivery of postsecondary education in Florida should be maintained.**

2. **The state university and community college planning processes should occur within the framework established in The Master Plan For Florida Postsecondary Education and subsequent master plan updates.** Future system planning activities should be scheduled to permit the specific plans developed by the sectors to address broad policy issues raised in the Commission's most recent master plan update. Through its planning process, the Board of Regents should articulate each SUS institution's long-range responsibility for achieving the Regents' goals for the system.

3. **Prior to the approval of any additional public universities, community colleges or joint-use facilities, a specific statewide planning process for creating new postsecondary institutions should be developed by the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, in conjunction with the Board of Regents and the State Board of Community Colleges.** The Commission should fulfill its legislative responsibility to "advise the State Board of Education regarding the need for and location of new institutions and campuses of public postsecondary education."

4. **Joint-use university facilities involving a university presence on a community college campus should be located no more than one hour from a main university campus, should be maintained for place-bound students and should not evolve into stand-alone institutions.** Specific criteria for joint-use facility planning should be included in a statewide postsecondary expansion plan (as indicated in Recommendation 3).

5. **Planning by state policymakers for future postsecondary services should be made in consultation with representatives from the independent colleges and universities.**

6. **Florida's two-plus-two system should continue to be recognized and reinforced in all enrollment planning and policy development.** The impact of the enrollment policy that allows the State University System to admit up to 15 percent of the previous year's high school graduating class should be jointly reviewed by the Board of Regents, the State Board of Community Colleges and the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission.

7. **The impact of limited access programs on the ability of both native lower division students and community college students to enter the upper division should be monitored by the Articulation Coordinating Committee.**

8. **The improvement of undergraduate education should be a goal of the highest priority for the state's universities in the 1990s.**

9. **The Board of Regents should convene a systemwide, blue-ribbon committee of faculty and administrators and charge it with making recommendations for devising an evaluation and reward**

system which provides recognition, compensation, tenure and promotion for effective teaching. The Committee should review promotion and tenure policies, the collective bargaining agreement and other policies and procedures that impact these activities.

10. **Throughout this decade, the Board of Regents, the State Board of Community Colleges and the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission should maintain as a priority goal the enrollment, retention and graduation of minority students, particularly black males, in the state's public colleges and universities.**

I. INTRODUCTION

In proviso language accompanying Specific Appropriation 587 of the 1989 General Appropriations Act, the Florida Legislature provided funds for the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission to "examine the overall structure for the delivery of public postsecondary education in Florida. The study shall include an analysis of the missions, locations, and capacity of existing institutions in light of projected population and enrollment trends over the next ten years. The study shall include recommendations on any modifications to the current structure including acquisition or creation of new institutions or systems, consolidation of existing institutions, facility transfers or other necessary changes. A report shall be submitted to the Legislature and State Board of Education by March 1, 1990."

Committee Activities

To direct this study, the Chairman of the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission appointed a Structure Committee consisting of Commission members Burke Kibler, Chairman, Robert Mautz, Alan Fickett, Robert Kerrigan, and Ralph Hogges to study the structure of postsecondary education in Florida and submit a full report to the Commission. The Structure Committee identified three preliminary issues to be addressed in the study: the effectiveness of the two state systems in providing governance and coordination for public higher education in Florida, the appropriateness of the current policies and procedures for establishing new campuses, centers and instructional sites, and the need for policies to guide a planned conversion of a joint-use facility into a separate college or university.

To facilitate the legislative charge, the Commission contracted with Augenblick, Van de Water & Associates (AVA) to conduct an extensive review of Florida's postsecondary education policy and planning documents as well as enrollment and demographic trends and projections. Augenblick, Van de Water and Associates invited three distinguished higher education policy experts, Patrick Callan, Senior Consultant for the Education Commission of the States, Vernon Crawford, Chancellor Emeritus, University System of Georgia, and Richard Richardson, Associate Director of the National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance, to serve as a review panel for the study.

During September and October, AVA conducted interviews with over 40 Florida education policy leaders, including Commission staff, legislative staff, State University System staff, community college staff, and a variety of campus leaders of the state's community colleges, public universities, and independent institutions. A preliminary consultant report was submitted in November, and served as the basis for testimony and discussion at public hearings that were held in December in Tallahassee, Orlando and Fort Lauderdale. In January, AVA presented their final report to the Structure Committee entitled "**An Examination of the Overall Structure For The Delivery Of Public Postsecondary Education in Florida.**" The report guided the Structure Committee in the development of its final report to the full Commission.

In serving as a lay advisory body to the State Board Of Education, responding to public testimony and input on postsecondary education issues has continued to be a high priority of the Commission. The Structure Committee received considerable testimony from the state's citizenry and postsecondary education community on the issues of this study, and on issues that are tangential to this study but of broad concern to the state. This input has been meaningful and has guided the development and the direction of the report. In addition, the Commission and its consultants received considerable assistance in the preparation of reports for this study from the staffs of the Department of Education, the Legislature, the Board of Regents, the State Board of Community Colleges, and numerous public and independent institutions.

II. POSTSECONDARY GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES

In the **State Postsecondary Education Structures Handbook**, 1988, the Education Commission of the States (ECS) has provided a review of the status of state-level postsecondary governance.

Consolidated Governing Board - Twenty-three states have adopted a consolidated governing board structure. In these states, most public institutions are governed by a single board which has total operating responsibilities for all institutions.

Coordinating Board - Twenty-three states have a coordinating board; typically, an agency between the governing boards of institutions and the governor and legislature. The functions of these boards differ substantially from state to state. In general, coordinating boards allow state governments to carry out centralized functions such as comprehensive planning and review of budgets and academic programs, while also allowing for the decentralized management of institutions by governing boards. Coordinating boards also can play a critical role in negotiating the resolution of conflicts between state government and the institutions.

Planning Agency - Four states (Delaware, Michigan, Nebraska and Vermont) and the District of Columbia have higher education planning agencies with limited authority. In these states, higher education governance is the responsibility of two or more boards.

Florida - The chief policy-making and governing body for public education in Florida is the State Board of Education. The Board of Regents governs the nine public senior institutions under statutory authority. The State Board of Community Colleges provides statewide leadership in overseeing and coordinating the 28 individually governed public community colleges. The Postsecondary Education Planning Commission serves as an advisory body to the State Board of Education on all postsecondary education matters. Florida, as well as Alaska, Oregon and New Hampshire, have both a consolidated governing board or multicampus system for their senior institutions as well as a coordinating or planning agency.

A National Perspective

Responding to the increased attention on educational outcomes and accountability by state legislators and policymakers, there has been a growing concern, nationally, about the condition of higher education governance at the state level. Specifically, the debate has been fueled by the complex issues of marked demographic changes, the growing needs of adults for retraining and special concerns about minority participation. A leading concern among many state leaders is that their higher education system may be overextended; that limited public resources are being spread over too many institutions with too little attention to differentiation of missions and quality. In ECS's Structures Handbook, the following issues were identified by governors and legislators as reasons for the restructuring of their higher education system:

- Actual or potential duplication of high cost graduate and professional programs;
- Conflict between the aspirations of two institutions located in one geographical area;
- Legislative reaction to intense institutional lobbying;
- Proposals to close, merge or change the missions of institutions;
- Concerns about the need for improved coordination among community college and vocational-technical schools;
- Concerns about the effectiveness of the state coordinating or governing agency.

The Education Commission of the States reports that, by 1972, 47 states had established either consolidated governing boards responsible for all senior institutions, or coordinating boards responsible for statewide planning and coordination of two or more governing boards. During the 1970s, the authority of many state boards gradually strengthened, but nationwide there were few major structural changes. The Education Commission of the States reports, however, that there was a major increase in the involvement of other executive branch agencies and legislative staff in higher education affairs, especially in budgetary matters.

In the 1980s, major changes occurred in only a few states. A number of states, including Florida, reorganized the state-level governance of community colleges, vocational-technical institutes and related programs. Other states, such as Pennsylvania, reorganized and consolidated the governance of major higher education sectors. Rhode Island abandoned its single board for all levels of education and established a separate governing board for its three public higher education institutions. Significant changes occurred in Massachusetts, where a new statewide governing board was established to replace all existing state agencies and boards, and in Connecticut, where a new and strengthened coordinating board was established.

Significant changes have occurred in five states since 1985. In Colorado and Washington, the existing coordinating boards were replaced by similar but strengthened coordinating bodies. In Alaska, the Board of Regents of the University of Alaska realigned all institutions under three university centers, each headed by a chancellor. Each of the community colleges was assigned to one of the three centers. In Oregon, the Oregon Education Coordinating Commission was abolished and the agency's functions were continued under the Oregon Office of Education Policy and Planning in the governor's office. In Texas, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board was renamed and expanded to give it power to set enrollment limits and to create a master plan for higher education in the state.

While structural changes at the state level are difficult and complex, individual states continue to make organizational structure changes to attempt to strengthen the delivery of postsecondary education in their state.

III. PUBLIC POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION IN FLORIDA

The Evolution of State Level Higher Education Governance in Florida

The evolution of Florida's system of higher education has been influenced by a number of social, economic and political conditions. As stated in the report: **State Efforts to Improve Quality in Higher Education in Florida: The Pursuit of Excellence Through Selective Enhancement**, the development of the system has been guided, within the state's tax structure of no state income tax, by three significant factors: (1) a need to expand higher education significantly, with the costs rising accordingly; (2) a steady move of public opinion, and thus of political leadership, toward explicit goals of quality enhancement in higher education; and (3) a reluctance to pay the increased costs of expansion and quality improvement on the part of many of the state's population, particularly the senior citizen population. These factors provide a framework for a review of the evolution of the state's Community College System and the State University System.

Community Colleges

The history of the development of community junior colleges in Florida has emphasized the identification of citizen and community needs in a framework of planned growth. In 1933, the first public two-year college was established in Florida at Palm Beach Junior College. The college was brought into being through an advisory committee consisting of representatives of local civic organizations, and from its inception, became a part of the county school system. Palm Beach Junior College was the only public two-year college until 1947 when St. Petersburg Junior College was changed from private to public. In 1947, the Minimum Foundation Program was established by the Legislature to provide all levels of education in Florida with at least a minimum level of financial support. This program recognized the need for junior college education especially in the larger population areas. It established a minimum local effort supplemented by state contributions according to an established formula for the support of all levels of education.

With the incentive provided by this program, Pensacola Junior College and Chipola Junior College were established and became parts of the school systems of their respective counties as public institutions. When Palm Beach, St. Petersburg, Pensacola, Chipola, and Washington junior colleges were approved by the State Board of Education as part of their respective county school systems, the principle of joint support became a reality. This system encouraged careful administration of the junior college budget and engendered local responsibility and involvement.

An advisory committee of local citizens was established for each community junior college. The committee had an advisory and consultative relationship to the County Board of Public Instruction on all matters pertaining to the junior college, and recommended policies, practices and procedures to the administration of the college.

In 1955, the Florida Legislature established the Community College Council. The Council's first formal master plan in 1957 recommended a comprehensive system of public community colleges in Florida. The plan stressed reasonable

cost, the open-door policy and geographic access. Specifically, its primary goal was to plan for the provision of post-high school education within commuting distance of 99 percent of Florida's population. Consequently, the 1957 Legislature authorized creation of the Division of Community Colleges in the State Department of Education and appropriated funds for six new community colleges to begin implementation of the master plan. The colleges were Central Florida Community College, Daytona Beach Community College, Gulf Coast Community College, Manatee Junior College, North Florida Junior College, and St. Johns River Community College.

As stated, most community colleges were originally governed by the boards of public instruction of local school systems. In 1968, the Florida Legislature established independent local boards of trustees for community colleges. Each board of trustees had legal responsibility for maintaining and operating its local college.

By 1972, with the opening of Pasco-Hernando Community College, the last of the 28 community colleges were established so that all Florida residents in all geographic regions of the State had accessible and affordable college education opportunities. All colleges offered the first two years of a baccalaureate degree, vocational education, and adult continuing education. With its successful implementation, Florida became a national model for the orderly development of a statewide system of public community colleges.

To further strengthen the operation of the State Community College System, the 1979 Legislature established the State Community College Coordinating Board. The board was reorganized in 1983 when the Legislature established the State Board of Community Colleges with the intent of providing more effective coordination, support and oversight over the 28 colleges. Since its creation, the primary focus of the Board has been to ensure that the colleges respond to their communities' needs for academic and vocational education. The Board has strived to preserve local control represented by the local boards of trustees, while at the same time establishing systemwide policies and coordination.

The community college system currently has over 50 campuses and 1000 delivery sites throughout the State where over 700,000 students are enrolled.

State University System

Prior to 1900, seven distinctive institutions of higher learning had been established in Florida. In 1905, the Buckman Act consolidated the white institutions into a university for men in Gainesville (University of Florida), retained the institution for women in Tallahassee (Florida State College For Women, later Florida State University), and redesignated the State Normal College for Colored Students (Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University) as a postsecondary institution. The Buckman Act also created a single Board of Control that governed the three institutions and reported to the State Board of Education. The three institutions enjoyed considerable autonomy, except that the state Legislature maintained specific control over funding for buildings and positions. As a result, the institution presidents dealt directly with the Legislature on significant budgetary and policy matters. Legislative decisions determined individual salaries, policy, location and size of buildings, expansion of academic programs and the competitive

relationship of each institution. The relatively autonomous relationship between the institutions and the Board of Control continued for the next five decades.

In the mid 1950s, responding to demographic shifts and a rise in population and urbanization, the Legislature authorized three new universities. The 1956 **Brumbaugh and Blee Study**, commissioned by Governor Leroy Collins, was the first Florida statewide study on higher education. The recommendations dealt primarily with growth, and the Legislature approved significant expansion in higher education, including the creation of a state community college system. The report identified issues of quality, concentration and research at upper division universities, and emphasized the need for access and equity in the new community college system.

In the following decade, six new universities were established, four of them being designated as upper division institutions. This structure enabled the older state universities to retain their designation as centers for graduate training and research. The single Board of Control over the universities was retained into the 1960s.

The decade of the 1960s brought increasing focus on higher education in the State due to the needs of the space program and due to the rapid growth of South Florida. A study, commissioned by the Board of Control and sponsored by the State "Council of 100" business leaders, urged the State to broaden the missions as well as the programs of all of the existing universities. This report also recommended the creation of a state college system, but such a plan was not pursued.

In 1965, the Legislature recognized a need for greater coordination over the universities and abolished the Board of Control and established a nine member Board of Regents. The Regents were given specific powers to govern, regulate, coordinate and oversee the institutions and agencies including the power to appoint university presidents.

In 1968, the executive branch of the state government was reorganized and the Board of Regents became a unit of the Department of Education, reporting through the Commissioner of Education to the State Board of Education. This centralization diminished the autonomy of the individual campuses, and led to the consolidation of university operating and building budgets. The Chancellor and his staff became the chief advisors to the Regents in these areas. New program proposals were formally and strictly reviewed prior to final approval by the Regents. In 1969, the Regents approved a **Comprehensive Development Plan** for the State University System that provided a framework for the development of the system that supported separately designated responsibilities for each institution without unnecessary duplication or proliferation.

The economic downturn of the early 1970s resulted in reduced operating budgets in the university system as well as stringent control over available resources and existing programs. Despite the economic problems, the university system further expanded when the Regents approved two new upper division universities, Florida International University and University of North Florida. Responding to a national movement toward educational program

accountability, however, there was a gradual shift in priority away from issues of access and expansion and toward issues of quality. A number of policies were enacted during the late 1970s to assess quality and to reward programs of enhancement through incentive funding. There was a concerted effort to fund programs that were considered to have potential for achieving excellence and national recognition through competition programs as the "Programs of Distinction," which evolved into the "Centers of Excellence" program. These programs were generously supported by the Legislature.

The Legislature, responding to public concern about quality, attempted to gain additional control over state-level governance without hampering "quality" initiatives. As a result of a twenty year review of the Florida Constitution, the Legislature approved new restrictions over campus appropriations and presidential authority. At the same time, however, the Legislature continued to target appropriations for "Quality Improvement Programs" designed to augment funding for academic program quality enhancement.

In 1979, the focus of governance shifted back to the campus when the Legislature, in an attempt to encourage "quality" initiatives in academic affairs, approved a compromise bill that diminished the authority of the Board of Regents and transferred substantial governing power to the universities. The Board of Regents retained responsibility for the adoption of systemwide rules and policies, planning for future system needs, reviewing and evaluating campus instructional, research and service programs, selecting presidents and monitoring fiscal performance.

The continuing debate on the authority of the Regents resulted in the establishment of a joint legislative and executive Commission on Postsecondary Education. The Commission submitted a report to the Legislature in 1980 that contained significant and far-reaching recommendations. The first recommendation was that the focus of future public policy for postsecondary education be on quality. A second major recommendation was that the goal of quality be achieved in part through planning and that a master plan be developed for all postsecondary education in Florida. The third recommendation related to governance and recommended the creation of a new Postsecondary Education Coordinating Council with powers to adopt a master plan, approve new programs, review and terminate old programs and review and recommend budget requests.

Significant legislative debate on the recommendations of the study produced a compromise bill that called for the creation of the planning commission, the reduction of powers of the Regents, and the establishment of individual campus boards of trustees. Governor Bob Graham vetoed the bill, but established by executive order the creation of the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission (PEPC). The Postsecondary Education Planning Commission was administratively housed in the office of the Commissioner of Education and was charged to prepare and submit to the State Board of Education a master plan for postsecondary education. Additional responsibilities included the authority to recommend to the State Board contracts for specific programs between the State and independent institutions. In addition, the order further reduced the authority of the Regents, by focusing their responsibilities on policy development rather than the details of daily campus

administration. The number of members of the Board of Regents was increased by the 1981 Legislature from nine to thirteen in an effort to end the alleged allegiance of each regent to a single university.

Throughout the 1980s, funds have continued to be appropriated to the State University System for quality improvement programs, trust funds, eminent scholar programs, matching-fund initiatives with the independent sector and undergraduate enhancement programs. The Legislature, however, has retained its involvement in these processes by relating the program priorities of the universities to the system master plan.

Florida's Postsecondary Structure: The Current Context

Florida has built a public higher education complex consisting of a system of nine state universities and a separate system of 28 community colleges. Many universities and community colleges have established additional campuses and centers, some of which have large and growing enrollments. The two systems are different in many ways, including governance.

As stated, the State University System (SUS) consists of nine universities, the Board of Regents and its staff. The **SUS Fact Book** states that the Board is analogous to a board of directors of a corporation and the Chancellor is its chief executive officer. Each state university is delegated responsibility for its own organization. On the state level, the Board of Regents is organizationally placed within the Division of Universities. The State Board of Education or Cabinet, as the chief policy and coordinating body for public education, must approve all rules adopted by the Regents as well as adopt and transmit the SUS legislative budget request. Included in this comprehensive system are two medical schools, two law schools, a dental school, a veterinary school, and the Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences. Each of the nine universities offers baccalaureate and selected graduate degrees in arts and sciences, business administration, education and other areas. Specialized undergraduate and graduate programs which are characterized by lower student and employer demand are located at a limited number of institutions.

Overseeing the second system, the State Board of Community Colleges (SBCC) was established in 1983 when it replaced the State Community College Coordinating Board. The system consists of 28 community colleges, some serving as many as six counties and some with as many as five campuses. Unlike the Board of Regents which is designated as the governing board for the state universities, each community college has its own board of trustees to which the institution's president is responsible. Thus, the State Board of Community Colleges (SBCC) must preserve the balance of maintaining regional control by local boards of trustees, yet at the same time establish statewide policies and ensure coordination. The SBCC also consists of 13 members, including the Commissioner of Education and a student member. The primary mission of community colleges is to respond to community needs for postsecondary academic education and postsecondary vocational education (Section 240.301, F.S.). The 1989 Legislature broadened the authorizing statute by adding economic development as part of the primary mission of community colleges.

The Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, created by executive order in 1980 and subsequently given statutory authority in 1981, serves as an advisory board to the State Board of Education on all postsecondary education matters. As emphasized in the Commission's 1988 **Master Plan Update**, substantial common effort between the State University System and Community College System has been exerted to assure realization of two goals for higher education in Florida. The first goal is that the majority of students complete their first two years of undergraduate study in a community college. The second is that transfer from a community college should be free from any academic penalty and as simple as moving from the sophomore to the junior year in a four-year university. The overall plan to emphasize the Community College System as the primary point of access is usually referred to as the "two-plus-two" plan for higher education.

Demographic Pressures

Florida has been experiencing rapid growth over the last forty years. During the 1980s, Florida's population has grown by approximately 3.3 million, a gain of 34 percent. During the 1990s, Florida's population is expected to grow an additional 2.8 million, a 10 year increase of 21.5 percent.

It is believed that the population of 15-44 year olds is of greater importance because it places the most demands on colleges and universities. Florida's 15-44 year olds population grew by almost 1.5 million during the 1980s, a 35.7 percent increase and is projected to grow by another one-half million during the 1990s, a 9.7 percent increase. Furthermore, these increases are not evenly distributed among the state's 67 counties.

Within the 15-44 year-old age group, the Commission examined the patterns of growth by county for two populations: the traditional college-going age group (defined by its closest census categories as 15-24 year olds) and the nontraditional college-going group (defined by census categories from 25 to 44 years old). Most counties growing at more than double the projected statewide average rate of growth are located in Southwest Florida (Charlotte, Collier, Glades, Lee), the East Central Coast area (Martin, Osceola, St. Lucie), and the West Central Coast area (Citrus, Hernando, Marion, Pasco).

The Commission also noted that while these counties account for the highest percentage increase in these age groups, the greatest increase in number of residents within these age groups is projected to occur in the more densely populated region of Southeast Florida (Broward, Dade, and Palm Beach Counties).

A Coordination and Planning Imperative

A major concept of Postsecondary Education Planning Commission's 1981 **Master Plan for Florida Postsecondary Education** was to build a more unified, cooperative and coordinated system with effective linkages among the various public and independent segments, and between postsecondary education and the community. The **Master Plan** stated that in our increasingly mobile and rapidly changing society, educational effectiveness will depend on the success with which people can move among educational institutions and into the workplace. The importance of effective transfer from the community colleges is greatly

responsible for lower division instruction. Such transfer has been quite successful and is so recognized nationally. But other forms of cooperation, such as joint faculty planning between postsecondary education and the community, are not as frequent or as far reaching as they should be.

Since the **Master Plan** and 1988 **Master Plan Update**, the commitment of the Commission to coordination, cooperation and planning has been manifest through its role in recommending projects to be funded through the Postsecondary Cooperation Trust Fund, its involvement in studies related to student transfer opportunities and accelerated articulation funding mechanisms, and sponsorship of the statewide Two-Plus-Two Articulation Seminar.

Responding to the rapid growth in size and complexity of the system, the **Master Plan** identified a key imperative that was underscored in the Commission's 1988 **Master Plan Update**:

> Greater clarity and distinctiveness in institutional roles are fundamental to the main goal of strengthening postsecondary education. Agreement on distinctive roles encourages institutions to focus on a limited number of priorities, making it more likely that each priority will receive the emphasis needed for a strong program. Distinctive roles also guarantee that diverse institutions and programs will exist, thus enabling a wide range of state needs to be met without compromising quality or duplicating resources. Clear roles allow for more coordinated, cost-effective use of state resources by limiting unnecessary duplication and by building centers of strength.

The development of Florida's system of postsecondary education has undergone dynamic changes as the needs of its population and economy have changed. The system continues to evolve, but through coordinated and qualitative initiatives and within a framework of increasingly limited resources.

IV. ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The Commission conducted a comprehensive review of the structure for the delivery of postsecondary education in Florida and found that the state's rapid growth, both in population and in demands for services, is taxing the capacity of its postsecondary institutions. In the past two decades, a number of states have addressed similar pressures by making a significant change in their postsecondary structure. The preliminary report of the Commission's consultants recommended that certain state universities be assigned a primary mission of research, while others focus primarily on teaching as a means of addressing the future pressures to provide additional undergraduate opportunities and meet the research needs of the State. This type of structure, while viable in other states, was overwhelmingly rejected by those participating in the statewide public hearings held by the Commission.

The evolution of the state's postsecondary structure was reviewed by the Commission, including how the nine universities and 28 community colleges have been positioned in the State and the public's perception of these institutions and the existing structure. Based on this review, the Commission believes that it would be unwise to recommend a major restructuring of the state's postsecondary systems.

Through the Commission's consultant report, public testimony and Commission discussion, however, a number of factors surfaced that are perceived as key determinants in how effective the state's postsecondary systems will be in this decade, both in terms of providing the quality and quantity of educational opportunities essential to a growing state. From these factors, the Commission has identified the following **priority goals** to guide the development of postsecondary education in Florida in the 1990s:

- **Strengthen long-range, statewide planning**
- **Improve undergraduate education**
- **Improve the enrollment, retention and graduation of the state's minority students**

These goals address key national problems in the delivery of postsecondary education that all states will face during this decade.

Organizational Structure

The Commission does not recommend a major restructuring of postsecondary education in the State. The solutions to the state's current and future education problems should come from within the existing system and the established and recommended planning processes. Structural tinkering can be a poor substitute for pointed analysis and for more effective performance within the existing organizational framework. The state university and community college systems have been successful in their efforts to enlarge, diversify and deepen their range of services to the state's citizens. Both systems are positioned to respond to the state's increasing demands for more and better educational services.

The Board of Regents, as the governing body for the state's nine public universities, provides an appropriate amount of direction for and support to the institutions. The Commission also believes that the current governance structure for the community college system is appropriate. The coordinating role of the State Board of Community Colleges coupled with the appointed local district boards of trustees enable the system to address both statewide and local concerns. The structure of the district boards of trustees provides for adequate local representation within multi-county districts.

The Commission has previously examined the issue of vocational education governance. In its 1989 report, **The Delivery and Governance of Postsecondary Vocational Education**, the Commission was unable to identify any specific problems at the local level that would be resolved or major improvements in services to students that would result from statewide merger of public postsecondary vocational training. The present structure provides significant flexibility for school districts and community colleges, in cooperation with the regional coordinating councils, to respond to those training needs by the more appropriate institution. Rather than a single statewide model, this flexibility has proven to be more effective at the local level. For example, a number of community colleges which are not designated as area vocational-technical centers are authorized to offer specific vocational certificate programs through agreements developed with local school districts. In some regions, programs have been voluntarily transferred between two providers and in one area a community college and school district are jointly supporting a single administrator for their respective vocational programs.

There is significant demand in Florida for effective vocational education. Rather than a continuing debate as to who should govern vocational training, the Commission continues to believe that the primary focus should be on the quality and responsiveness of the instructional services provided. The latter should be the paramount issues addressed by those responsible for designing vocational programs for students, employers and the State of Florida.

Recommendation:

1. **The existing structure for the governance and the delivery of postsecondary education in Florida should be maintained.**

Planning for Postsecondary Education

Statewide Coordination

A state's system for the delivery of postsecondary education, as every large organizational system, must balance a variety of differing viewpoints during the process of role differentiation and mission assignment. Tensions that develop during this process typically derive from the varying perspectives of the participants - elected political leaders who attempt to balance an unwieldy array of public issues, system leaders who attempt to set a framework for overall development of the institutions that they are charged to lead, institutional leaders who attempt to respond to pressures from local constituents, and individuals who attempt to maximize their own interests. Resolving these tensions to meet an ever-changing set of state needs is a difficult undertaking.

Based on a review of plans and policies, interviews with a variety of educational leaders and testimony received at public hearings, the Commission's consultants identified the following key tensions in Florida's postsecondary arena: the expression of ambitious goals for the State University System within a context of limited resources; the conflicting goals of quality and access; the ongoing national debate of a research versus teaching emphasis; and coordination of statewide planning versus institutional aspirations.

These tensions are neither unique to Florida nor necessarily unhealthy. The key consideration is that there is an overall structure in place that allows competing priorities to be aired, decisions to be made and, most importantly, planning to occur. Each state has its own history of development and traditions which have led to its current organization and structure. Florida is different from most other states in several aspects. One difference is the designation of elected cabinet officials as the State Board of Education with broad responsibilities for all aspects of education in the State. A second difference is the absence of a system of regional state colleges. A third difference is the strong role played by community colleges in preparing a majority of students for upper division undergraduate work. A fourth difference is the absence of a large independent sector of postsecondary education.

In Florida, three distinct planning processes for higher education exist. The Postsecondary Education Planning Commission (PEPC) focuses on the development of a state level master plan for all of postsecondary education. This plan is updated every five years. The planning process for the Board of Regents involves extensive interaction between the Regents and the universities and results in a five year plan which includes goals, mission statements and specific plans for new program development at the existing institutions. A third planning process, conducted by the State Board of Community Colleges, focuses on the state's community colleges and establishes guidelines for the development of the colleges over the next five years.

The Board of Regents five-year plan relies upon a strong governing board and central office to balance regional interests (for those regions which already have a university) with a broad statewide plan and appropriate resources. The process would be strengthened if each set of five-year plans was placed within a broader framework that provides direction for the long-range development of each institution, particularly the newer institutions. During the review of plans and policies, as well as public testimony, the Commission found no stated, long-range plans as to how the six universities established since 1960 should develop and mature.

To both ease and move beyond the existing tensions that have been identified, the Commission recognizes a need for coordinated, farsighted and strategic planning among all of the state's postsecondary systems. The three planning processes must be better coordinated within a broad perspective of the state's delivery of postsecondary education, as policy options will be increasingly difficult and sensitive. While planning does not guarantee that the existing state structure will be effective, the lack of coordinated planning makes effectiveness improbable.

Planning for New Institutions

Decisions to create new institutions of higher education have depended heavily on the location of the population at the time. The University of Florida (UF), Florida State University (FSU) and Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University (FAMU), for example, were located in the more populous, northern portion of the State during the late 1800s. As the population base and political power shifted in the State, new institutions were established in those regions to serve growing populations.

The **Master Plan for Florida Postsecondary Education**, as well as the master planning for the State University System and Community College System historically has not included a planning process for the development of new public institutions. Shifting political currents and a lack of an established long-range growth or expansion plan can lead to an uncoordinated approach to addressing the higher education needs of a region. One of the best examples to demonstrate the need for long range, coordinated planning has been the arduous process that has occurred in order to determine the higher education needs of Southeast Florida.

Southeast Florida has been of particular interest to the State for the last decade. Throughout this period, the Commission has been asked to study the postsecondary needs of the region. These studies have resulted in the development of various plans for the delivery of postsecondary education in the region. In 1986, the Commission completed a study on the feasibility of merging FAU and FIU to form a single four-year institution with multiple campuses in Southeast Florida. The Commission recommended that merger was not feasible but that a standing Southeast Florida Committee should be created. In 1986, the Commission, the Board of Regents and the State Board of Community Colleges jointly adopted a ten year enrollment plan to address growth in Southeast Florida. In 1987, these three groups adopted a report on the **Postsecondary Needs of Broward County** that designated FAU as the lead institution and called for an expansion of graduate and honors program offerings in the county. In 1989, the Board of Regents reconfirmed the basic provisions of this plan and further recommended placing sole authority for SUS programs in Broward with FAU, expanding FAU's upper division and graduate programs in the county, and relaxing the FAU and FIU limitations in lower division enrollments at the Palm Beach and Dade County campuses. The 1989 Legislature approved a branch campus of FAU in Broward County at the BCC Davie joint-use facility site. The bill also asked that the BOR and the Commission make recommendations prior to 1993 concerning the establishment of a separate four-year public university in Broward County.

In addition to Southeast Florida, most regions of the State have experienced significant population growth in the last two decades. The state's growth has created additional geographic population centers that may need additional postsecondary education sites in the next 10 to 20 years. During public hearings, the Commission received testimony on the need for additional universities in the State. To avoid the confusion that has taken place in defining and addressing the postsecondary education needs in Southeast Florida, a clearly-defined planning mechanism is needed. The magnitude of

such a decision to fulfill these needs through the establishment of a new institution requires structured, comprehensive planning based on accurate growth projections and specific expansion criteria.

Recently, the Board of Regents and the State Board of Community Colleges have acted on requests for new campuses or centers at existing institutions. While both boards may have the general statutory authority to recommend new institutions, such action should not come as an isolated recommendation, but should be part of an overall, coordinated plan to address the postsecondary needs of the State. Any plan should define what constitutes justifiable state need, current and maximum capacities of existing institutions and the parameters (including numbers of students to be accommodated and types of institutions needed) within which the university system and the community colleges should plan for enrollment growth and new institutions.

Through the establishment of institutions, branch campuses, centers and other education delivery sites, the State has strived to minimize geographic barriers to postsecondary opportunities. The philosophy, in concert with the rapid population growth in many areas served by community colleges but not by a university, led to the establishment of joint-use facilities. Two or more state boards can cooperatively establish a common educational facility to accommodate students. At the postsecondary level, these facilities consist of a combined office and classroom building constructed primarily for use by one system upon the campus of another. Several universities have a large permanent office and classroom building on or adjacent to community college campuses. These sites enable commuting students who have completed their associate of arts degree to pursue a baccalaureate degree in one of several undergraduate or graduate degree programs offered. Joint-use of libraries, recreation and dining facilities is encouraged. Currently, six such sites exist. These sites provide a variety of undergraduate and graduate program offerings tailored to the needs of place-bound students, and are cost-effective, cooperative means of providing postsecondary education opportunities.

The careful consideration which stems from coordinated planning is needed prior to activating any institutional plan that attempts to modify the institution's boundary or sphere of influence. During the Commission's public hearings, concern was expressed about the potential conversion of joint-use sites into stand-alone universities. The 1988 **Master Plan Update** cautioned that a sense of regionalism coupled with the philosophy that caused the geographical dispersion of educational institutions could promote local drives for a conversion of a community college/university joint-use operation into a separate state-supported four-year college or university. The Commission concurs with the view of the consultants that joint-use facilities should be designed to serve non-traditional or place-bound students.

Policy planning for the delivery of postsecondary education in the State should take into account the plans of Florida's independent colleges and universities. According to the consultant's survey of 13 Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF) institutions, FTE enrollments are projected to grow by almost 23,000 between 1988 and 2000, an increase of over 52 percent. Two institutions, Nova University and Barry University, account for 79 percent of this anticipated growth.

Recommendations:

2. **The state university and community college planning processes should occur within the framework established in The Master Plan For Florida Postsecondary Education and subsequent master plan updates.** Future system planning activities should be scheduled to permit the specific plans developed by the sectors to address broad policy issues raised in the Commission's most recent master plan update. Through its planning process, the Board of Regents should articulate each SUS institution's long-range responsibility for achieving the Regents' goals for the system.

3. **Prior to the approval of any additional public universities, community colleges or joint-use facilities, a specific statewide planning process for creating new postsecondary institutions should be developed by the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, in conjunction with the Board of Regents and the State Board of Community Colleges.** The Commission should fulfill its legislative responsibility to "advise the State Board of Education regarding the need for and location of new institutions and campuses of public postsecondary education."

4. **Joint-use university facilities involving a university presence on a community college campus should be located no more than one hour from a main university campus, should be maintained for place-bound students and should not evolve into stand-alone institutions.** Specific criteria for joint-use facility planning should be included in a statewide postsecondary expansion plan (as indicated in Recommendation 3).

5. **Planning by state policymakers for future postsecondary services should be made in consultation with representatives from the independent colleges and universities.**

Enrollment Planning

Approximately two-thirds of Florida high school graduates who enroll in public higher education in Florida attend community colleges. The basis of the state's two-plus-two system is to widen geographic access to postsecondary education; first to lower division programs, then to baccalaureate education. Every community college student who successfully completes an associate in arts degree program is guaranteed a space in the upper division at one of the state universities. Articulation between community colleges and public universities is well-defined and, for the most part, works efficiently.

The Commission received considerable testimony in regard to the current State University System policy of admitting a maximum of 15 percent of the previous year's high school graduating class. The Commission strongly believes in the need to maintain the integrity of the community college missions. The state's community colleges should remain the primary point of access for students pursuing a baccalaureate degree.

The emphasis on quality in the SUS has raised additional concern about access to the system, especially in a state that has experienced a 34 percent population increase in the last decade. The increase in the number of upper-division programs that limit enrollment (limited access programs) at the University of Florida and at Florida State University has caused further restriction of upper division opportunities within the State University System. While some policymakers believe that larger and additional universities will guarantee student access, there is concern that, if resources remain restricted and the state's population increases as projected, the system may not be able to provide sufficient access to the upper division. As stated in another section of this report, sound enrollment data and projections are needed along with a structure for planning in order to analyze enrollment policies.

Recommendations:

6. **Florida's two-plus-two system should continue to be recognized and reinforced in all enrollment planning and policy development.** The impact of the enrollment policy that allows the State University System to admit up to 15 percent of the previous year's high school graduating class should be jointly reviewed by the Board of Regents, the State Board of Community Colleges and the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission.

7. **The impact of limited access programs on the ability of both native lower division students and community college students to enter the upper division should be monitored by the Articulation Coordinating Committee.**

Undergraduate Education

During the last decade, the undergraduate experience for university students has been closely scrutinized for review of process and outcomes. Numerous national commissions have issued policy reports that identified shortcomings and recommended both renewed commitment and increased funding for undergraduate enhancement. Concern over the inadequate preparation of college-bound students, the fragmentation of learning into narrow disciplines with little sense of purpose or goals, the conflict between career-oriented curriculum and the liberal arts, the faculty reward system for research as it detracts from emphasis on teaching, and the inability to determine an institution's success in fulfilling its mission are several of the issues that have been identified and debated.

The State of Florida has undertaken a number of programs in the last ten years to attempt to strengthen the undergraduate experience. The State has insisted on minimal levels of preparation in the basic skills of computation and communication. To address the assessment of student accomplishments, the State has focused on tracking the results of the College Level Academic Skills Test (CLAST) examination and State Board Rule 6A-10.030, FAC, which requires a specific number of hours in English or humanities and mathematics.

The Commission has provided ongoing support for the state's undergraduate enhancement programs and for the review of their outcomes. The 1988 **Master**

Plan Update recognized that state policymakers have an appropriate role in affecting curriculum and called for an assessment of the current status of general education coursework requirements to provide information regarding the impact of Florida's efforts to improve undergraduate education. The Update noted that a catalog analysis and student survey were necessary to determine which courses students are required to take and student attitudes about those requirements. The Update also recommended a transcript analysis to review the actual coursework taken by students. In the 1989 study, **An Assessment of the General Education Curriculum in Community Colleges and State Universities in Florida**, the Commission assessed the implementation of the state's policies relating to general education curriculum requirements in the public universities and community colleges. The study included a survey on student perceptions of the state's general education requirements, a catalog analysis of general education requirements, and a transcript analysis which determined which types of courses students actually take during their first two years in college.

For the past six years, the State University System has received approximately $34.25 million for undergraduate enhancement activities, primarily for improving undergraduate instruction, academic advising, faculty salaries, and student services. A significant portion of these funds was intended for use to reduce the size of general education classes. In the 1988 **State University System Master Plan**, the Board of Regents referred to a student to faculty ratio of 22:1 and adopted as its primary goal for the next five years to "improve the quality of undergraduate education." As a follow-up to its 1989 study of general education, the Commission is currently examining class size levels and academic advising in its 1990 study of **The Impact of Undergraduate Enhancement Funding** at state universities.

The most critical aspect of undergraduate education that has been identified to the Commission is the value of and need for quality college and university teaching. While recognizing that the State has established visible undergraduate enhancement programs, it is apparent that, paralleling a national dilemma, these programs often run counter to the emphasis of and support for faculty research activity.

In the last two decades, national support for university research activity has significantly increased. The Commission recognizes that strong, aggressive university research programs are essential for our State. Research is a fundamental part of the mission of many universities and faculty have an abiding interest in the process and rewards of meaningful research. The renewed emphasis on classroom teaching and the competing activities in research and public service, however, have caused considerable stress for faculty.

In a 1989 national survey of over 5000 faculty by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, over 70 percent responded that their interests lie in teaching, and a significant percentage also concluded that "teaching effectiveness should be the primary criteria for promotion." In this survey, most faculty at four-year institutions reported that the reward system is heavily weighted toward published research, not effective teaching; and more than one-third of faculty supported the proposition that, at their institutions, publications are "just counted, not qualitatively measured."

Even at research universities, a surprising 42 percent agreed with this statement.

The report concludes that:

> Research is essential to American higher education. Now, more than ever, scholars must discover new knowledge and advance the frontiers of their field. Therefore, funding for basic research should be expanded, not diminished. But the nation's colleges and universities enroll, every year, over 12 million students of great diversity and in so doing, accept a profoundly important obligation also to promote excellence in teaching.

In the 1982 **Master Plan**, the Commission recognized that "faculty are the key to a stronger system of postsecondary education in Florida." It does little good to espouse excellence in teaching, however, if faculty continue to be reinforced and rewarded for research activity. Under the existing system, faculty must follow the financial and other professional incentives of the academic reward system, which are weighted toward research and scholarship. While research productivity enhances promotion and tenure opportunities and elevates faculty to the position of university "scholar," at many universities the teaching role remains a secondary consideration in promotion and tenure decisions. The **Master Plan** stated that "the creative energy of faculty should be directed to teaching while maintaining research responsibilities." For this to occur, there is a need for a comprehensive package of State initiatives that will develop a faculty reward and development system that promotes quality teaching. In this regard, the 1989 Legislature appropriated $2.8 million for undergraduate enhancement, including $1.06 million which has been assigned by the State University System for outstanding teaching/advising awards on a competitive basis.

Florida has a unique opportunity to take a national leadership role in undergraduate education through a commitment of resources and policies that both support and reward teaching at the postsecondary level. The Commission believes that effective teaching and other student-centered faculty activities need to be rewarded more generously in the compensation system. Policies and procedures are needed that increase both the prestige and compensation for outstanding teachers. A commitment by state policymakers, administrators and faculty will be needed to meet this challenge.

Recommendations:

8. **The improvement of undergraduate education should be a goal of the highest priority for the state's universities in the 1990s.**

9. **The Board of Regents should convene a systemwide, blue-ribbon committee of faculty and administrators and charge it with making recommendations for devising an evaluation and reward system which provides recognition, compensation, tenure and**

promotion for effective teaching. The Committee should review promotion and tenure policies, the collective bargaining agreement and other policies and procedures that impact these activities.

Minority Participation

The State of Florida, through specific program initiatives and funding enhancements, has maintained a commitment through the last decade to increase minority access to postsecondary education in all regions of the State. Through a number of legislative reports and studies, the Commission has monitored the participation of racial/ethnic minorities in the state's postsecondary systems.

Florida's 15-24 year old black population was estimated to be 18.7 percent of the total 15-24 year old population in 1988 (up from 17.7 percent in 1980). Blacks are expected to continue to increase as a proportion of the population during this decade. A brief review of the enrollment patterns of blacks in public colleges and universities indicates that recent efforts to recruit and retain black students at predominantly-white public colleges and universities have been marginal. In 1988, 17.5 percent of Florida's high school graduates were black, a percentage that has declined over the last three years. At the community colleges, 4.8 percent of those receiving Associate in Arts degrees in 1988 were black. In the State University System that year, 7 percent of first-time-in-college students were black and 4 percent of those receiving baccalaureate degrees were black.

In the State University System, 8.7 percent of the total system enrollment for Fall 1989 were black students. Over 50 percent of this group were enrolled at Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University (FAMU), a historically-black institution. Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University serves a vital role in the State and, because of its significant strides in the last decade, has become a strong and popular destination for many of Florida's minority students. Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University's success has made the recruitment of the state's minority students increasingly difficult for other system institutions. It is believed, however, that this interinstitutional competition is healthy and will result in greater postsecondary opportunities for the state's minority students.

There is an emerging student population of international students in the state's postsecondary institutions whose particular needs warrant special attention by institutional academic and student affairs administrators. Florida, as a coastal state with a growing international reputation, ranks high among all states in population diversity. The rich cultural mix found throughout the State has played a significant role in Florida's development as an international center and in attracting business and industry. The Hispanic presence, in particular, has had a notable impact on the economic life of the State and is evidenced in trade, tourism, foreign investments and foreign-owned businesses.

In recent years, there has been a steady increase in the enrollment of international students in both the State University System and the Community College System. As an example, in Fall 1987, there were 11,242 students with

a foreign residency in the SUS, and in Fall 1988, there were 9632 students with a foreign residency in the state's community colleges. As the population of Florida continues to expand, international students will enroll in the state's institutions in increasing numbers. These special population groups, particularly on campuses with large international enrollments, will require academic and student services that are designed to address their special needs.

In a 1984 supplement to the 1982 **Master Plan** entitled **Enhancing the Participation of Minority and Disadvantaged Students in Postsecondary Education**, the Commission outlined a series of actions to guide Florida in pursuing the goals of greater educational access and quality. In addition to the primary emphasis on access, there is now a critical need to address issues of student achievement, specifically the concerns and challenges of minority student retention and the development of programs that facilitate the completion of a degree. The 1988 **Master Plan Update** called for "the identification and assessment of exemplary retention programs so that information pertaining to these programs could be distributed systemwide."

Recommendations implemented from the 1988 **Update** included incentives to increase minority student participation in the State, including additional funding for retention programs, more minority teachers and role models, continued support of the "college-prep" curriculum, programs to strengthen minority performance on the CLAST exam, and better articulation information for transfer students entering the State University System. Additionally, the Commission continues to support special legislative appropriations for specific groups as well as for academic and financial aid programs that are designed to enhance the educational opportunity and advancement of minority and disadvantaged students. In **Programs to Enhance the Participation of Minority and Disadvantaged Students in Florida Postsecondary Education**, the Commission regularly provides an inventory of existing state programs that enhance minority participation.

Although progress has been made in the participation of minorities in the state's postsecondary institutions, there must be a commitment from the state and institution leadership to sustain the gains of the last decade. The new decade will provide both a critical challenge and an opportunity to increase minority enrollments and improve graduation rates in the State. To make a significant difference will require a commitment of resources, personnel and programs in a clearly supportive campus environment. Successful approaches will include new state funds for financial assistance, an ongoing minority faculty/staff recruitment program at each institution and well-planned campus programs of academic and career advising, tutoring and social support.

Recommendation:

10. **Throughout this decade, the Board of Regents, the State Board of Community Colleges and the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission should maintain as a priority goal the enrollment, retention and graduation of minority students, particularly black males, in the state's public colleges and universities.**

Conclusion

The Commission conducted a comprehensive review of the structure of the delivery of postsecondary education in Florida. As the structure has evolved to meet the state's postsecondary needs, the Community College System has removed major geographic barriers and provided access to postsecondary education throughout the State and the State University System has provided broad undergraduate education and a wide array of graduate and professional programs. In this new decade, however, the determination of policies for the growth and emphasis of postsecondary education in Florida will be increasingly difficult and sensitive.

The State is projected to continue to grow in population and in demands for a higher quality of education for its citizens. While the capacity of the existing postsecondary systems will need to be increased in the near future, the planning process for this activity by the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, the Board of Regents and the State Board of Community Colleges must be coordinated within a broad perspective of the state's delivery of postsecondary education. The Commission believes that, within a framework of cooperation, coordination and farsighted planning, the existing postsecondary structure will be able to meet the state's future postsecondary needs.

APPENDIX A

Consultant's Report: An Examination of the Overall Structure for the Delivery of Public Postsecondary Education in Florida

AN EXAMINATION OF THE OVERALL STRUCTURE FOR THE DELIVERY OF PUBLIC POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION IN FLORIDA

FINAL REPORT TO THE STRUCTURE COMMITTEE OF THE FLORIDA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PLANNING COMMISSION

Prepared by

AUGENBLICK, VAN DE WATER & ASSOCIATES

January 17, 1990

AUGENBLICK, VAN DE WATER & ASSOCIATES
1370 PENNSYLVANIA STREET, SUITE 220 • DENVER, CO 80203 • (303) 832-3444

FOREWORD

In proviso language accompanying the Specific Appropriation 527 of the 1989 General Appropriations Act, the Florida Legislature provided funds for the Florida Postsecondary Education Planning Commission (PEPC) to "examine the overall structure for the delivery of public postsecondary education in Florida. The study shall include an analysis of the missions, location, and capacity of existing institutions in light of projected population and enrollment trends over the next ten years."

PEPC formed a Structure Committee to supervise the study and contracted with Augenblick, Van de Water & Associates (AVA) to conduct the analysis. To assist in examining options for Florida, AVA invited three distinguished higher education policy experts to serve on a Review Panel for the study. They are: Patrick M. Callan, former vice president of the Education Commission of the States and former Director of the California Postsecondary Education Commission; Vernon Crawford, Chancellor Emeritus of the University System of Georgia; and Richard C. Richardson, professor of higher education at Arizona State University, Associate Director of the National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance, and founding president of Northampton County Area Community College in Pennsylvania.

During September and October, AVA conducted an extensive review of Florida's postsecondary education policy and planning documents as well as enrollment and demographic trends and projections. We also conducted interviews with over 40 Florida education policy leaders, including legislative staff, PEPC staff, state university central office staff, community college central office staff, and a variety of campus leaders at community colleges, public universities, and independent colleges (see Appendix A for a list of interviewees).

AVA prepared an interim report for the Structure Committee in November. This interim report was widely distributed in Florida and formed the basis for public hearings held in Tallahassee, Orlando, and Ft. Lauderdale during December. Testimony given at the public hearings by concerned citizens, business and industry leaders, institutional faculty and administrators, students, and board members was carefully reviewed and served as the primary basis for revisions to the interim report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

BACKGROUND 3

Demographics 3
Enrollment Trends 4
Policy Context 4

CHARTING A COURSE FOR THE NINETIES 8

STRUCTURAL ADAPTATIONS FOR THE NINETIES 14

MISSION STATEMENTS 22

LOCATION OF INSTITUTIONS 27

CAPACITY OF INSTITUTIONS 29

The Future of Joint-Use Facilities 32

CONCLUSION 34

APPENDICES

A. Background Tables 35
B. List of Interviewees 46

INTRODUCTION

This report focuses on the ability of the current structure of postsecondary education to cope with the enrollment and demographic trends Florida faces in the Nineties. It is organized into six sections: (1) a summary of salient background information, including the context for postsecondary policy making in Florida; (2) a statement of policy emphases for postsecondary education for the Nineties; (3) an assessment of the overall adequacy of the current structure of postsecondary education in Florida; (4) an analysis of mission statements; (5) a discussion of the process of locating new institutions; and (6) an analysis of capacity issues.

We conclude that, overall, the current structure in Florida can work effectively in the period ahead <u>if statewide planning by the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission (PEPC), the state university system, and the community colleges continues to be strengthened, especially with regard to overall enrollment planning and continued mission differentiation.</u> Specific recommendations are made throughout the text and are highlighted for ease in identification.

Issues concerning finances, legislative intrusion, changes in the economy, and recruiting new faculty were raised during interviews and public hearings but were outside the scope of this study. Of these major topics, each of which should be reviewed

regularly, we believe that the issue of finances is one of the most pressing. As Florida continues to look to its future, the level of financial resources, the basis for providing resources, and methods of accountability for resource expenditure should be examined.

BACKGROUND

Demographics

Florida has been experiencing rapid growth over the last forty years. During the Eighties, Florida's population has grown by approximately 3.3 million, a gain of 34%. During the Nineties, Florida's population is expected to grow an additional 2.8 million, a ten year increase of 21.5% (see Table A-1).

For our purposes the population of 15-44 year olds is of greater importance because it places the most demands on colleges and universities. Florida's 15-44 year old population grew by almost 1.5 million during the Eighties, a 35.7% increase, and is projected to grow by another one-half million during the Nineties, a 9.7% increase (see Table A-2). Furthermore, these increases are not evenly distributed among the state's 67 counties (see Table A-3).

Within the 15-44 year old age group, we examined the patterns of growth by county for two populations: the traditional college going age group (defined by its closest census categories as 15-24 year olds) and the non-traditional college going group (defined by census categories from 25 to 44 years old). Most counties growing at more than double the projected statewide average rate of growth are located in Southwest Florida (Charlotte, Collier, Glades, Lee), the East Central Coast area (Martin, Osceola, St. Lucie), and the West Central Coast area

(Citrus, Hernando, Marion, Pasco). Table A-4 shows these counties by age group.

We also noted that while these counties account for the highest percentage increase in these age groups, the greatest increase in number of residents within these age groups is projected to occur in the more densely populated region of Southeast Florida (Broward, Dade, and Palm Beach counties).

Enrollment Trends

Within the community college sector, our major concern centered on enrollment in transfer programs ("advanced and professional"). Following a decline in the 1983-85 period, enrollments rose sharply in the 1985-90 period, are projected to continue to rise, although at a slower rate in the early Nineties, and are expected to rise rapidly again during the latter half of the decade (see Table A-5).

The state university system is also planning to accommodate increased demands for undergraduate and graduate education. Full-time-equivalent (FTE) enrollment in the State University System (SUS) is projected to grow from 97,000 in 1990-91 to 132,000 in 1999-2000, an increase of 36% (see Table A-6).

Policy Context

Postsecondary education policy making operates within a state context that is determined by previous policy and funding decisions and a complex web of relationships among policy makers

in the legislature, governor's office, state agencies, and campuses. Through interviews and public hearings, we began to develop an understanding of this context in Florida. In our view, the context for policy making has the following highlights.

* Florida is a reasonably wealthy state which chooses not to tax its citizens very heavily. Florida's 1987 tax capacity of $1,656 per capita ranks it 15th in the nation.[1] Florida's tax effort is 77.2% of its capacity, ranking it 49th. In 1987, this combination produced tax revenue of $1,278 per capita, 35th in the nation. This is the most important contextual factor in Florida because it singlehandedly restricts policy options in all areas of state government.

* Within this constraint, Florida's funding effort on behalf of higher education is very high, ranking fourth nationally with an index of 139 (relative to the national average of 100).[2] This combination of high effort within a low tax framework produced 1988-89 higher education appropriations per student of $4,723 (11th nationally).

---

[1]Tax capacity is defined as the dollar amount of revenue each state and its local governments would raise if they applied a nationally uniform set of rates to a commonly used set of tax bases. This measure is prepared annually by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) and is used to compare states' capacity to generate revenue for governmental purposes.

[2]Effort is defined as a ratio of education appropriations per student relative to tax revenues per capita. For further information see Kent Halstead, "State Profiles: Financing Public Higher Education 1978 to 1989", published by Research Associates of Washington, September 1989.

* Florida is also a low tuition state. In 1988-89, Florida ranked 42nd in tuition revenue per student. The tuition level, considering all students, was 76% of the national average.

* In the policy arena, relationships between legislators (and legislative staff) and higher education professionals has been characterized by more than the usual skepticism. Consequently, legislation tends to be more specific and constraining than in many other states.

* While much attention is given to planning among educators, the results have not been consistently used in the legislative process.

* Over the last thirty-five years, Florida has emphasized expanding access to postsecondary education through the creation of a statewide network of community colleges and the addition of six public universities.

* Florida's universities wish to retain maximum flexibility to develop as they deem appropriate. The Board of Regents Master Plan seeks to define and shape institutional missions.

There are a number of current policies that we assume will continue in the future. These include:

* keeping tuition levels low;
* continuing open access at community colleges;
* continuing 2+2 articulation agreements;
* maintaining a cap on lower division university enrollments;
* continuing, and probably tightening, the conditions which limit access to certain upper division programs at certain universities;
* continuing to use the CLAST examination as a screening device for entry into the upper division of universities.

CHARTING A COURSE FOR THE NINETIES

Within any governance structure, there is always debate over the relative emphasis given to the fundamental goals of the system at any particular time. Our view, developed from a review of documents, interviews, and testimony from public hearings, is that Florida continually needs to assess its position relative to its goals and readjust its emphases periodically. In the Nineties, this assessment should include the five areas identified below.

(1) Enhancing undergraduate education. The State University System Master Plan lists "improving the quality of undergraduate education" as its first priority.[3] It goes on to enumerate seven objectives to be pursued. We support these objectives but would add an eighth which we feel is critical to the success of this goal: the faculty reward structure should be altered to recognize more explicitly that instructional excellence is central to enhancing undergraduate education. The current path to promotion and tenure within the university system is too heavily weighted toward research and publication criteria. The teaching function receives short shrift, both in the preparation of new faculty and in their reward system. We recommend that the State University System appoint a blue-ribbon committee of faculty and charge it

[3] "State University System of Florida Master Plan 1988-89 - 1992-93", p. 14.

with making recommendations for improving the teaching skills of current and new faculty as well as devising an evaluation and reward system which restores the balance between the teaching and research functions. Action on this recommendation will place Florida in a leadership position in the country on an issue that is receiving increasing attention.

(2) Extending geographic access. Overall, Florida has done a good job of locating its colleges and universities. The most recent example of extending geographic access is the initiation and continued implementation of the Comprehensive University Presence Plan for Southeast Florida. The painful history of this recent case, however, suggests that planning for the extension of geographic access needs to be improved. We return to this issue in our discussion of location issues.

Looking to the future, extension of the philosophy of providing postsecondary education opportunities within commuting distance of significant portions of the population will mean devising ways to serve developing population centers. The most apparent need for new opportunities during the next decade is in the Charlotte/Collier/Lee region of Southwest Florida. This region, with a projected 15-44 year old population base of 250,000 in the year 2000 is geographically distant from any current university and will need substantially more postsecondary opportunities than it currently enjoys. Other areas of the state that should be monitored to determine future needs include the

Indian River/Martin/St. Lucie area and the Citrus/Hernando/Pasco area.

Given the planning requirements for providing new opportunities, it is appropriate to begin now to design the delivery of postsecondary opportunities to these growth areas. We suggest an approach to this type of planning in our discussion of location issues.

(3) Expanding access to lower division undergraduate programs. Of those Florida high school graduates who enroll immediately in a public college or university in Florida, approximately two-thirds attend community colleges and one-third attend a state university. Articulation between community colleges and public universities is well-defined and works efficiently. Every community college student who successfully completes an Associate in Arts degree program is guaranteed a space in the upper division somewhere within the state university system. We support the continuation of the policy that makes community colleges in Florida the main access point to higher education and we support the continuation of the 2+2 articulation system. We believe, however, that more qualified Florida students should have choices among postsecondary institutions comparable to choices enjoyed by students in other states. In our view, the current state university system goal of admitting a maximum of 15% of the previous year's high school graduating class is too restrictive and should be gradually increased over

the next decade. Easing this cap will provide increased access to the universities for those students whose backgrounds and interests would be better served by enrolling immediately in a university setting and will broaden the pool of eligible minorities. The universities should be encouraged, or even required, to use this enlarged pool to increase the proportion of underrepresented minorities in their student bodies. The prospect of increased growth should permit expansion of lower division enrollment within the university system without damaging the quality of academic transfer programs in the community colleges.

(4) Improving the recruitment and retention of traditionally underserved groups. Florida's 15-24 year old black population was estimated to be 18.7% of the total 15-24 year old population in 1988 (up from 17.7% in 1980). Blacks are expected to continue to increase in the Nineties as a proportion of the population. A brief review of the enrollment patterns of blacks in public colleges and universities in Florida indicates that recent efforts to recruit and retain black students at predominantly white public colleges and universities have not been not very

successful.[4] In 1988, 17.5% of Florida's high school graduates were black, a percentage that has declined over the last three years. At the community colleges, 4.8% of those receiving Associate in Arts degrees in 1988 were black. In the state university system (excluding Florida A&M University where 97.8% of first-time-in-college students were black in 1988), 7.0% of first-time-in-college students in the state university system were black and 4.0% of those receiving baccalaureate degrees were black.

These figures indicate the need for ongoing emphasis on the recruitment and retention of black students at Florida's public colleges and universities. We recommend that over the next decade, Florida give a high priority to increasing the enrollment and graduation of black students. Florida's goal should be proportional enrollment in two- and four-year programs and comparable achievement of hitherto underrepresented minorities.

(5) Monitoring access to upper division undergraduate programs. The increase in the number of upper division programs which limit enrollment (known as Limited Access Programs) at the University of Florida and Florida State University has led to our

---

[4] Information in this section is based on a February 1989 report, "1989 Three-Year Trend Analysis of Minority Enrollment (1986-88) and Degrees Conferred (1985-87) in the State University System by Race and Sex". Hispanic students are much more closely proportional to their presence in the overall population and achieve degrees at rates similar to the white population. In addition, a forthcoming book, Achieving Access and Quality: Case Studies in Equity by Richard C. Richardson, Jr. and Elizabeth Skinner Fisk (ACE-MacMillan, Summer 1990) analyzes the consistent declines in both the enrollment and graduation rates of black students in Florida during the Eighties.

concern about the eventual reduction of upper division opportunities within the state university system. We recommend continued monitoring of this practice and, as warranted, the creation of additional upper division spaces in high demand majors within the system.

STRUCTURAL ADAPTATIONS FOR THE NINETIES

Every large organizational system must balance a variety of differing viewpoints through the process of mission assignment. These tensions in the system derive from the varying perspectives of participants - elected political leaders attempt to balance an unwieldy array of public issues, system leaders attempt to set a framework for overall development of the institutions they are charged to lead, institutional leaders attempt to respond to pressures from local constituents, and individuals attempt to maximize their own interests. Resolving these tensions to meet an elusive set of state needs is a difficult undertaking.

The first step toward resolution is identification of the tensions. Based on our review of plans and policies, interviews with a variety of educational leaders, and testimony received at public hearings, we have identified the following tensions.

(1) <u>High aspirations in a context of limited resources</u>. Aspirations are reflected in such statements as:

> "The Board of Regents has set as its most compelling goal for the next five years to be regarded as one of the nation's five best university systems."[5]

---

[5] "State University System of Florida Master Plan, 1988-89 - 1992-93", p.4.

"The University of South Florida is committed to the goal of becoming one of the top 25 state-assisted universities in the United States by the year 2000."[6]

"The key to educational excellence in the community college is its ability to respond to the diversity of its students with quality instructional programs."[7]

Enunciating high aspirations is an important ingredient in any strategy designed to foster greatness. We support and encourage this effort. We recognize, however, that the speed with which such aspirations can be realized is greatly affected by the level of resources available. This is a point of tension. Because resource limitations exist, priorities must be set. Setting priorities necessarily involves providing greater or lesser emphasis on certain goals, leading some constituents of the system to feel slighted.

(2) Quality and access. Balancing these two fundamental goals has been an issue in American higher education for the last three decades. In general, America's success in responding to both ideals has led to a system of higher education that is envied around the world. Over the last 35 years, Florida has

---

[6]"State University System of Florida Master Plan, 1988-89 - 1992-93", p. 26.

[7]"Challenges: The State Board of Community Colleges 1988 Master Plan", p. 4.

placed great emphasis on access through the creation of its community college system and the addition of six public universities. In recent years, the State University System has emphasized quality issues through its Eminent Scholars program, increases in admissions standards, encouragement of funded research, and other measures. Predictably, this emphasis has raised a new round of concerns about access to the system, especially in a state that experienced a 34% population increase in the Eighties and particularly for blacks whose enrollment and graduation rates at the predominantly white institutions declined during the last decade.

(3) Teaching and research. In university circles, recognition of quality is closely linked with successful research efforts. Recognition among the international community of scholars is the accepted standard of excellence. In contrast, undergraduate students and their parents tend to be more concerned with the quality of instruction which the universities provide. This tension is reflected on one side by the incentives built into the faculty reward system and, on the other side, by calls for the improvement in undergraduate instruction. In our view, the relative emphasis between teaching and research is out-of-balance in Florida and needs to be re-examined.

(4) Institutional aspirations and statewide planning. It is the nature of individual universities to desire to expand their

offerings in response to both their own vision of what they wish to become and the perceived needs of the constituents they serve. From a statewide perspective, however, it is apparent that each institution cannot be all things to all people. Functional differentiation is required in order to develop areas of quality and provide reasonable access within limited resources. Establishing a workable balance is typically accomplished through mission differentiation and resource allocation procedures.

These tensions are neither unique to Florida nor unhealthy. What is important is that there be a structure in place which allows competing priorities to be aired, planning to occur, and decisions to be made. There is no one structure that fits every state. Each state has its own history of development which has led to its current organization and structure. Florida is different from most other states in several key respects. One difference is the designation of elected cabinet officials as the State Board of Education with broad responsibilities for all aspects of education in the state. A second difference is the absence of a system of regional state colleges. A third difference is the strong role played by community colleges in preparing a majority of students for upper division undergraduate work.

Although these difference are real, they are less important than the query, "Does the structure work?". To explore this issue, we posed four key questions that we believe any structure

of higher education must be able to answer affirmatively.

(1) Is there a means of gathering and analyzing data to assess performance in light of plans and policy decisions?

(2) Is there a means of sorting through issues, establishing priorities, and making policy decisions which allows broad participation and timely decisions?

(3) Is there a means of knitting together the variety of institutional aspirations to produce a systemwide response to state needs?

(4) Is there a means of resolving difficult issues that arise outside of the normal planning process?

The first question focuses on the gathering and analysis of information in order to set goals and assess progress toward them. Our impression is that Florida has made considerable strides in this area over the last few years by increasing the data and analytic capabilities of state agencies. More needs to be done, however, in the area of long range strategic planning, especially enrollment planning, so that appropriate system and institutional plans are developed in response to fundamental shifts in demography and the economy. Some of this work is beginning to occur in the central office of the state university system. **We recommend that PEPC become more actively involved in assessing the projected needs of Florida's population for postsecondary opportunities.** This would include examining

demographic projections and making timely recommendations to the State Board of Education on the nature and location of new campuses and other outreach activities.

The second and third questions focus on the planning and decision-making structure of the system. In Florida, there are three distinct planning processes for higher education. One, conducted by PEPC, focuses on overall directions for postsecondary education in the state. PEPC is charged by the legislature with preparing and submitting to the State Board of Education a master plan for all of postsecondary education every five years. The most recent plan, published in 1988, updates the original 1982 plan. The plan is based on a series of issue papers developed by PEPC and discussed in public hearings and meetings of the full Commission. The process allows all interested parties to participate prior to adoption of the plan.

A second process, conducted by the Board of Regents, focuses primarily on the state's nine universities. The process involves extensive interaction between the Regents and the universities and results in a five year plan reviewing the progress of the last five years and setting directions for next five years.

A third process, conducted by the State Board of Community Colleges, focuses on the state's community colleges and articulates seventeen challenges designed to guide the development of the community colleges over the next five years.

Each process provides extensive opportunity for analysis and comment prior to final approval. The state university and community college planning processes ideally should occur within the framework established in the PEPC master plan. This does not appear to be the case at present since each of the processes run concurrently. **We recommend a shift in timing to allow the PEPC process to be completed before the state university and community college processes begin.**

Within the framework of these processes, there appears to be ample opportunity for existing systems and institutions to develop and debate issues, establish priorities and make policy decisions in both a broadly participative and timely fashion. As noted earlier, this process should be adapted to include planning for the delivery of postsecondary services to areas of population growth.

Another adaptation that would improve the planning process would be to strengthen the evaluation of institutional and system efforts to meet planning goals. Good evaluation practice requires that the evaluator be an outsider with no stake in the evaluation results. **We recommend that, as part of its master plan responsibilities, PEPC identify key statewide issues (such as those suggested in "Charting a Course for the Nineties") and conduct an independent assessment of progress prior to each new master plan cycle.**

The fourth question addresses structural ability to resolve unanticipated problems. These problems, typically stimulated

outside the academy, are inherently more difficult to solve because they must be addressed outside the normal channels and frequently under great political pressure and with sustained media attention. A good example in Florida is the provision of additional educational services in Southeast Florida through the Comprehensive University Presence Plan. A concerted effort by state and local leaders eventually produced a solution to a complicated problem. While we have reservations about the potential for duplication among graduate program offerings, we strongly support the expansion of undergraduate opportunities in Broward County. We believe that issues such as these can be resolved within established processes if PEPC takes a more proactive role in recommending appropriate locations for new postsecondary opportunities.

There will, however, always be unanticipated problems that must be addressed. In the current structure these situations are handled by assigning intra-system problems to the appropriate state board and broader problems to PEPC. This division is appropriate and should be maintained in the future.

MISSION STATEMENTS

Mission differentiation is necessary in order to maximize excellence and efficiency within available resources and to create a commonly understood framework for the development of individual universities. Policy makers at all levels should clearly understand the basis for differentiation among the universities.

Florida's current approach to controlling individual university development is to negotiate missions and program development every five years as part of the Master Plan process with a goal of nurturing nine distinctive universities that are responsive to both state and regional needs. The elements which comprise institutional distinctiveness - size, age, location, nature of the student body (academic characteristics, residential v. commuter, age, sex, race, etc.), service region, program offerings, degree offerings, and relative emphasis given to research, teaching, and community service - are typically spelled out in mission statements.

The mission statements of the state universities, as published in the Board of Regents' Master Plan, have two basic components. The first is a fairly standard narrative which covers the basic philosophy and describes the current components of the university. The second is a listing of the new programs that the university wishes to establish in the ensuing five year period. This listing "is the outer limit of what a university

may explore until 1993, not a guarantee of approval by the Board of Regents or the Florida Legislature."[8]

This system places a premium on a strong governing board being able to balance regional interests (for those regions which already have a university) with statewide needs and resources every five years. Continuing strong leadership on the part of the Board and the central office is pivotal to successful implementation of this approach. The current leadership has brought a measure of discipline to the process, but, as leadership changes over time, there is no assurance that this discipline will be continued. The structure would be strengthened if each set of five year plans was placed in a broader framework which set forth the characteristics each university should possess when it reaches maturity.

In our Interim Report to the PEPC Structure Committee we sought to provide a clear framework for future development by enunciating eight principles that we believe should guide the development of postsecondary education in Florida over the next decade. These principles include: clearly distinguishing between statewide research universities and regional teaching universities; concentrating doctoral programs at research universities; increasing undergraduate education opportunities in large metropolitan areas; limiting the undergraduate outreach activities of research universities; increasing the opportunities

---

[8] "State University System of Florida Master Plan 1988-89 - 1992-93", p. 5.

for qualified undergraduate students to enroll in the lower division of public universities; providing new undergraduate opportunities in areas of rapid population growth; and restricting the use of joint-use facilities to primarily serving non-traditional students in sites within one hour of the home campus.

Our goal was to focus the roles of each of the universities more sharply in order to provide a clearer basis for short-term policy decisions. In addition, as we looked to the future, we developed a growing concern about the increasing imbalance between research and teaching within the university system.

Testimony at the public hearings on the Interim Report led us to conclude that our principles were overly simplistic for a state as large and complex as Florida. We continue to believe, however, that Florida needs to adopt a set of principles similar to those we developed in order to promote a clearer understanding of the long range missions of its public universities. That the Board of Regents already utilizes such principles was made clear by the Board chair in his testimony at the Fort Lauderdale public hearing. In that testimony, he explicitly enumerated four mission categories for Florida's public universities and assigned each of the universities to one of the categories:

(1) statewide, comprehensive research universities (UF, FSU);

(2) historically black university (FAMU);

(3) regional universities with limited doctoral programs (UWF, UNF, UCF); and

(4) urban, comprehensive research universities (USF and FIU/FAU in combination under the Comprehensive University Presence Plan).

It is our understanding that these categories are not official Board policy and have not been shared with other policy makers. We recommend that the Board of Regents develop and adopt a long range mission statement for each of the public universities as part of its Master Plan. This statement should address such topics as the optimal size of each university, the nature and extent of program and degree offerings, and the relative emphasis given to research and teaching. By identifying long term goals, that is, the characteristics that each university should possess when it reaches maturity, policy makers at all levels will be able to place short-term policy decisions in the context of long-term goals. This, in turn, should help to reduce the mistrust we found among state agencies, the legislature, and institutional leaders. Adopting such a long range mission statement should also reduce the pressure on the Regents to successfully balance regional interests with statewide needs and resources every five years.

We support the Regents' recent efforts to clarify institutional missions and we urge that these efforts be continued. In addition to the long range mission statements

recommended above, we recommend that future efforts be directed toward articulating each institution's responsibility for achieving the Regents' goals for the state university system. The current Master Plan articulates four basic goals: improving the quality of undergraduate education; solving critical problems and seizing opportunities for the state; forging public-private partnerships to help the System achieve its goals; and increasing efficiency by cutting costs without sacrificing quality. What is missing is the connection between these goals and explicit identification of how each university will contribute to the goals. By making this connection, it is much easier to evaluate institutional contributions to achieving the Regents' goals.

We recommend further that the Board of Regents consider designating some universities as centers of excellence in undergraduate education with special responsibility to provide state leadership in undergraduate education. As part of such a designation, faculty reward structures should be altered to ensure that rewards for excellence in teaching are commensurate with rewards for excellence in research.

Mission differentiation is less of an issue within the community college sector because each college has a clearly defined geographic service region and is charged with providing a broad range of educational services. We found community college mission statements to be sufficiently broad to allow appropriate responses to local conditions. We see no need to make fundamental changes to these statements.

LOCATION OF INSTITUTIONS

Historically, decisions to create new institutions of higher education depended heavily on the location of the population at the time. The University of Florida and Florida State University, for example, were located in the then more populous northern portion of the state. As the population base and political power shifted to the south in Florida, new institutions were established there to serve growing populations.

Over time the political process can be expected to produce new institutions in developing growth centers in Florida. Left unattended, the decision about where to place new institutions will be determined by who holds political power at the time of the decision.

A missing element in this process is a more detached analysis of the needs of population growth centers and resulting recommendations concerning appropriate priorities for extending new educational opportunities. We recommend that such a plan be developed by PEPC in consultation with the community colleges, the state university system, and the independent colleges. In our view, this is an appropriate role for the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission. Its enabling statute empowers it to "advise the State Board of Education regarding the need for and location of new institutions and campuses of public postsecondary education." In addition, PEPC is the only

educational agency in Florida state government which does not represent a particular constituency.

The plan should identify future state and regional needs, current and planned capacities, and the parameters (including numbers of students to be accommodated and types of institutions needed) within which the university system and the community colleges should plan for enrollment growth and new institutions. PEPC may wish to consider the appropriateness of setting maximum enrollment targets in relation to mission for existing and new campuses.

Our own review of demographic trends leads us to conclude that the Southwest Florida region (Charlotte, Collier, Lee counties) is a prime candidate for a new university by the turn of the century. Since planning and start-up activities typically take six to eight years, PEPC should begin this effort in the near future. This plan should be reviewed and updated regularly.

CAPACITY OF INSTITUTIONS

Our review of enrollment data and interviews with educational leaders in community colleges revealed that community colleges have responded to enrollment demands in the past and plan to continue to respond in the future by increasing in size. This response is appropriate for community colleges given their open access mission and their major role as the general access point to baccalaureate degrees in Florida. We conclude that community colleges are well located to respond to demand and will continue to meet these demands as Florida grows. Enrollment projections for the Nineties show continued increases but at a slower rate.

Funding to support enrollment growth is based on a three year rolling average of enrollments. This approach has a built-in lag factor which, in times of growth, results in state funding for community colleges not fully recognizing increases in enrollment until two years after it has occurred. Florida may wish to explore a change in its funding formula for community colleges.

The state university system is currently altering its method of projecting and planning for enrollment growth. Current estimates show an expected increase of 36% in full-time-equivalent enrollments during the Nineties (see Table A-6). We tested the appropriateness of the SUS projections by creating a county-based participation rate model and using a variety of

assumptions about changes in participation rates over time to estimate demand. Based on this analysis, we concluded that SUS enrollment growth projections, if funded, will be able to meet overall projected demands.

Planning for enrollment growth implies having adequate physical facilities for accommodating such growth. The data available for capacity analysis is limited to classroom capacity. Our analysis of present classroom capacity shows that, among state universities, two (FAU and UWF) are currently operating at capacity and one (USF) is very near capacity. By the Fall of 1993, four universities (USF, FAU, UWF and FIU) will exceed their current capacity by 10% to 34% (see Table A-7). Assuming that plans currently underway are funded and implemented (a somewhat risky assumption given the limited dollars generated by Florida's PECO program), capacity will be expanded sufficiently to meet demand (although with some lag expected).

Within the community college sector, projected enrollment growth is expected to exceed current capacity by more than 60,000 FTE students in 1995. By 1995, the current capacity is projected to be adequate for only five of the 28 community colleges (see Table A-8).

Classroom capacity is only part of the story. Existing classroom capacity could be more heavily utilized if support facilities (libraries, faculty offices, laboratories, dormitories) were expanded. Although we do not have data on these types of facilities, several interviewees indicated that

existing classroom capacity at state universities could accommodate approximately one-third more students if adequate support facilities were available.

The problem here is a lack of appropriate facilities data for long range planning purposes. **We recommend that each system develop a methodology, with supporting data, that can be used to project and prioritize overall facilities needs.** Such a methodology should not be limited to classroom space. It should also include laboratories, libraries, faculty offices, dormitories, and special use facilities.

Policy planning for future capacity should also take into account the plans of Florida's independent colleges and universities. In order to get a sense of the future plans for enrollment growth at independent institutions, we contacted the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF) and arranged for a survey of their members. For the thirteen institutions responding to the survey, FTE enrollments are projected to grow by almost 23,000 between 1988 and 2000, an increase of over 52% (see Table A-9). Two institutions, Nova University and Barry University, account for 79% of this anticipated growth.

As plans are made by the public sector for extending service to new areas, we encourage public sector policy makers to remain sensitive to the impact of such plans on the independent sector and to consult independent sector representatives before reaching final decisions.

The Future of Joint-Use Facilities

Capacity issues also include the future of joint-use facilities. Several names - joint-use facility, shared-use facility, branch campus - are used to identify locations of instructional sites away from a main university campus. Currently, there are 15 such sites associated with state universities and enrolling an estimated 5,595 full-time equivalent students (see Table A-10). These sites provide a variety of undergraduate and graduate program offerings tailored to the needs of placebound students in the area.

Questions have been raised about the potential development of these sites into stand-alone universities, perhaps melding them with community colleges to form new institutions. We can envision no circumstance in which an outreach activity of a university should be combined with a community college to form a new free standing four year college or university. In our view, joint-use facilities and other outreach activities should be used primarily to serve non-traditional, placebound students. We further believe that these facilities should not be more than one hour away from the sponsoring campus in order to promote greater interaction among faculty at both sites and enable students to enroll in some courses at the main campus.

If population growth and distance to an existing university support the creation of a new university (as we believe they do in Southwest Florida), then it is preferable to create a university de novo. The physical plant of the joint-use facility

should be turned over to the community college (which would also be required to expand to serve the growing population base). The community college's open access mission and diversity of programs, including vocational/occupational and economic development, will continue to be needed.

CONCLUSION

Florida has much to be proud of in its systems of postsecondary education and much work yet to be done. We conclude that the present structure of postsecondary education, with the adaptations we have recommended, is adequate for the tasks ahead and should not be fundamentally altered.

We further recommend that policy makers reassess the priorities that have served them well for the last decade and, for the next decade, place greater emphasis on undergraduate teaching, access to undergraduate opportunities, and achieving a proportional representation of minorities in Florida's public colleges and universities.

APPENDIX A

TABLE A-1
FLORIDA'S POPULATION GROWTH, 1950-2000

Year	Population	Gain Over Previous Period	
		Number	Percent
1950	2,771,000	-	-
1960	4,952,000	2,181,000	78.7%
1970	6,791,000	1,839,000	37.1%
1980	9,746,000	2,955,000	43.5%
1990	13,088,000	3,342,000	34.3%
2000	15,899,000	2,811,000	21.5%

Source: 1950-1980: Statistical Abstract of the United States; 1990-2000: Bureau of Economic and Business Research, University of Florida, Bulletin No. 89-90.

TABLE A-2
FLORIDA'S 15-44 YEAR OLD POPULATION, 1980-2000

Year	Population	Gain Over Previous Period	
		Number	Percent
1980	4,073,000	-	-
1990	5,528,000	1,455,000	35.7%
2000	6,066,000	538,000	9.7%

Source: Bureau of Economic and Business Research, University of Florida, Bulletin No. 89-90.

TABLE A-3
FLORIDA POPULATION ESTIMATES AND PROJECTIONS BY COUNTY FOR AGES 15-44

County	Census 1980	Estimate 1988	Projections 1990	1995	2000
Alachua	91,491	106,533	108,884	113,800	116,583
Baker	7,184	8,818	9,181	9,565	9,766
Bay*	45,872	62,664	66,831	71,431	73,856
Bradford	9,371	11,666	11,777	11,842	11,536
Brevard	118,712	164,523	175,439	190,348	200,285
Broward	401,114	499,677	516,588	540,258	549,030
Calhoun	3,695	4,094	4,354	4,375	4,402
Charlotte*	14,798	24,087	26,428	30,755	33,501
Citrus*	15,406	24,040	26,516	30,918	33,793
Clay*	32,565	48,330	52,690	59,485	63,490
Collier*	32,911	49,973	54,207	61,875	66,692
Columbia	15,812	19,243	19,925	21,077	21,761
Dade	703,659	814,896	832,599	841,049	844,783
Desoto	7,900	10,010	10,417	10,930	11,146
Dixie*	3,337	4,258	4,368	4,662	4,806
Duval	272,124	325,888	338,766	350,587	358,913
Escambia	112,922	138,137	143,496	148,372	150,233
Flagler*	3,703	6,697	7,621	8,885	9,432
Franklin	3,177	3,655	3,734	3,735	3,695
Gadsden	17,662	21,336	22,143	23,004	22,891
Gilchrist	2,532	3,065	3,108	3,278	3,396
Glades*	2,208	2,953	3,181	3,538	3,736
Gulf	4,386	5,220	5,433	5,657	5,710
Hamilton	3,619	4,418	4,615	4,585	4,609
Hardee	8,170	9,619	9,982	10,162	10,377
Hendry*	8,236	11,537	12,184	13,124	13,803
Hernando*	13,711	24,853	18,236	32,972	36,185
Highlands*	15,529	21,346	22,835	25,237	26,578
Hillsboro.	304,061	393,926	413,915	435,196	447,714
Holmes	5,946	6,927	7,303	7,666	7,741
Indian Riv.*	22,263	32,874	35,469	39,736	42,386
Jackson	16,856	20,447	21,430	22,743	23,617
Jefferson	4,371	5,325	5,518	5,608	5,541
Lafayette	1,697	2,451	2,539	2,825	2,979
Lake*	35,576	47,652	50,555	55,069	57,740

TABLE A-3 Continued

County	Census 1980	Estimate 1988	Projections 1990	1995	2000
Lee*	73,103	112,361	122,536	139,802	149,993
Leon*	86,296	103,403	106,486	111,836	115,178
Levy	7,673	9,448	9,817	10,413	10,751
Liberty*	1,743	2,034	2,132	2,298	2,422
Madison	5,975	6,834	6,971	7,127	7,045
Manatee	50,176	65,354	68,625	73,227	75,775
Marion*	47,210	69,484	74,851	84,011	89,909
Martin*	22,701	34,653	37,247	41,892	44,751
Monroe	28,126	35,080	36,274	36,413	35,736
Nassau*	15,363	22,091	23,806	26,570	28,408
Okaloosa*	56,764	79,337	84,707	91,186	94,561
Okeechobee*	8,518	12,257	13,188	14,803	16,187
Orange	225,527	300,621	319,075	341,168	353,923
Osceola*	20,080	39,457	44,214	51,861	57,217
Palm Beach*	217,462	316,149	340,165	377,743	400,341
Pasco*	55,320	74,259	79,592	90,005	96,708
Pinellas	249,697	309,808	318,426	323,689	321,507
Polk	139,550	176,882	185,484	197,436	202,982
Putnam	19,386	23,540	24,260	25,260	25,452
Santa Rosa	27,782	33,596	34,695	35,924	36,389
Sarasota	64,414	83,118	86,953	93,500	96,502
Seminole*	83,094	128,168	139,798	157,153	167,092
St. Johns*	21,647	35,659	39,089	44,210	47,385
St. Lucie*	34,373	53,981	58,402	66,441	72,037
Sumter	9,705	11,079	11,429	11,906	12,297
Suwanee*	9,065	11,195	11,615	12,558	13,003
Taylor	7,003	8,169	8,370	8,518	8,621
Union	6,339	6,528	6,908	7,283	7,345
Volusia*	97,690	136,676	145,597	159,309	166,050
Wakulla*	4,815	6,719	5,921	8,183	8,801
Walton*	8,168	10,840	11,556	12,371	12,840
Washington	5,655	6,333	6,470	6,497	6,556
TOTAL	4,072,956	5,266,251	5,528,310	5,874,942	6,066,470

* indicates those counties with projected 1980-2000 population growth of 15-24 years olds greater than 25% (statewide average = 14.8%).

Source: Bureau of Economic and Business Research, University of Florida, "Population Estimates and Projections by Age, Sex and Race for Florida and its Counties, 1988-2000", Bulletin No. 89-90, May, 1989.

TABLE A-4
FLORIDA COUNTIES WITH PROJECTED 15-44 YEAR OLD
GROWTH RATES AT LEAST DOUBLE THE STATEWIDE AVERAGE

Area	Fastest Growing Florida Counties by Age Group	
	15-24 Years Old	25-44 Years Old
Southwest Florida	Charlotte Collier Glades Lee	Charlotte Collier Lee
East Central Coast	Martin Osceola Palm Beach St. Lucie	Indian River Martin Okeechobee Osceola St. Lucie Seminole
West Central Coast	Citrus Hernando Marion Pasco	Citrus Hernando Marion Pasco
Northeast	Clay Flagler	Flagler Nassau St. Johns
Panhandle	N/A	Wakulla

Source: Bureau of Economic and Business Research, University of Florida, "Population Estimates and Projections by Age, Sex and Race for Florida and its Counties, 1988-2000", Bulletin No. 89-90, May, 1989.

TABLE A-5
ACTUAL AND PROJECTED FTE ADVANCED AND PROFESSIONAL (A&P) ENROLLMENT LEVELS, FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGES, 1983-2000

PART A. A&P ENROLLMENT (College Transfer)

College	A&P FTE Enrollment Level				
	Actual		Projected		
	1983-84	1985-86	1990-91	1995-96	2000-01
Brevard	3,350	2,968	3,939	4,645	6,074
Broward	6,371	5,567	6,874	7,537	8,935
Central Florida	1,032	902	1,477	1,788	2,484
Chipola	537	587	739	762	837
Daytona Beach	2,150	1,928	3,041	3,456	4,535
Edison	1,728	1,610	2,276	2,772	3,894
Fla CC at Jax	4,791	3,844	4,931	5,342	6,334
Florida Keys	394	330	429	452	518
Gulf Coast	1,274	1,205	1,705	1,875	2,344
Hillsborough	4,080	3,387	4,988	5,558	6,779
Indian River	1,651	1,442	1,958	2,307	3,156
Lake City	711	535	618	660	785
Lake-Sumter	542	474	573	663	854
Manatee	2,012	1,869	2,933	3,168	3,939
Miami-Dade	14,520	14,420	16,891	17,772	19,627
North Florida	299	375	407	443	497
Okaloosa-Walton	1,213	1,034	1,446	1,607	2,060
Palm Beach	3,381	3,404	4,447	5,378	7,308
Pasco-Hernando	615	639	1,155	1,336	1,886
Pensacola	2,889	2,658	3,379	3,679	4,219
Polk	1,499	1,294	1,822	1,927	2,327
St. Johns River	460	471	941	1,051	1,424
St. Petersburg	5,019	4,840	6,189	6,425	7,206
Santa Fe	2,986	2,840	3,863	4,119	4,860
Seminole	1,705	1,488	2,383	2,806	3,925
South Florida	295	312	572	624	776
Tallahassee	1,853	1,997	3,311	3,425	4,018
Valencia	3,776	3,589	5,442	6,125	7,970
TOTAL	71,131	66,007	88,727	97,702	119,571

TABLE A-5 Continued

PART B. PERCENTAGE CHANGE

College	Percentage Change 1983-1985	1985-1990	1990-1995	1995-2000
Brevard	-11.4	32.7	17.9	30.8
Broward	-12.6	23.5	9.6	18.5
Central Florida	-12.6	63.7	21.1	38.9
Chipola	9.3	25.9	3.1	9.8
Daytona Beach	-10.3	57.7	13.6	31.2
Edison	-6.8	41.4	21.8	40.5
Fla CC at Jax	-19.8	28.3	8.3	18.6
Florida Keys	-16.2	30.0	5.4	14.6
Gulf Coast	-5.4	41.5	10.0	25.0
Hillsborough	-17.0	47.3	11.4	22.0
Indian River	-12.7	35.8	17.8	36.8
Lake City	-24.8	15.5	6.8	18.9
Lake-Sumter	-12.5	20.9	15.7	28.8
Manatee	-7.1	56.9	8.0	24.3
Miami-Dade	-0.7	17.1	5.2	10.4
North Florida	25.4	8.5	8.8	12.2
Okaloosa-Walton	-14.8	39.8	11.1	28.2
Palm Beach	0.7	30.6	20.9	35.9
Pasco-Hernando	3.9	80.8	15.7	41.2
Pensacola	-8.0	27.1	8.9	14.7
Polk	-13.7	40.8	5.8	20.8
St. Johns River	2.4	99.8	11.7	35.5
St. Petersburg	-3.6	27.9	3.8	12.2
Santa Fe	-4.9	36.0	6.6	18.0
Seminole	-12.7	60.1	17.8	39.9
South Florida	5.8	83.3	9.1	24.4
Tallahassee	7.8	65.8	3.4	17.3
Valencia	-5.0	51.6	12.6	30.1
TOTAL	-7.2	34.4	10.1	22.4

Source: Actuals: State Board for Community Colleges, CCMIS228, 11/11/89; Projections: SBCC, "Outyear FTE Projections", CCMIS219 9/29/89.

TABLE A-6
PROJECTED FTE ENROLLMENT GROWTH AT FLORIDA'S STATE UNIVERSITIES

University	1990-1991	1995-1996	1999-2000
U. of Florida	21,774	24,752	29,785
Florida State U.	17,525	19,907	23,875
Florida A&M U.	4,698	5,366	6,622
U. of South Florida	16,797	19,021	22,627
Florida Atlantic U.	6,499	7,346	8,716
U. of West Florida	4,361	4,927	5,827
U. of Central Florida	10,919	12,365	14,790
Florida International U.	10,826	12,241	14,560
U. of North Florida	3,863	4,367	5,171
SUS Total	97,260	110,292	131,993

Source: State University System of Florida, "Enrollment Projections, 1990-91 Through 1999-2000", October 2, 1989. The State University System is currently shifting from its traditional five-year enrollment planning approach to a more strategically focused approach. The new methodology is currently being constructed and tested. The figures above should be viewed as preliminary and based on planning assumptions which may change in the future.

TABLE A-7
COMPARISON OF DERIVED CLASSROOM CAPACITY, CURRENT ENROLLMENT AND PROJECTED ENROLLMENT AT STATE UNIVERSITIES

University	1988 FTE Derived Classroom Capacity	FTE Enrollment Fall 1987	Percent of 1988 Capacity	FTE Projected Enrollment Fall 1993	Percent of 1988 Capacity
UF	27,192	21,841	80%	22,575	83%
FSU	26,778	16,312	61%	17,419	65%
FAMU	8,301	4,131	50%	4,695	57%
USF	15,969	15,445	97%	17,554	110%
FAU	5,428	5,685	105%	7,287	134%
UWF	3,649	3,716	102%	4,455	122%
UCF	12,040	9,790	81%	10,949	91%
FIU	10,151	8,882	87%	11,691	115%
UNF	5,427	3,355	62%	4,128	76%
TOTAL SUS	114,935	89,157	78%	100,753	88%

Sources: Capacity information was provided by Jerry Martin, Associate Director, Capital Budgets, State University System of Florida in a September 12, 1989 letter to Dr. Linda Recio, Postsecondary Education Planning Commission. Fall 1987 FTE enrollment data comes from the State University System of Florida, 1987-88 Fact Book, Table 10, page 21. Fall 1993 projected enrollment comes from State University of Florida, "Five-Year Enrollment Plan, 1989-90 through 1992-93", December 1988.

TABLE A-8
COMPARISON OF PROJECTED 1995 ENROLLMENTS WITH ESTIMATED CURRENT CAPACITY AT FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Community College	Current Student Capacity - FTE	Projected FTE Enrollment	Capacity Over (Under) Projected
Brevard	10,538	10,502	36
Broward	10,996	12,809	(1,813)
Central Fl	2,877	3,821	(944)
Chipola	2,079	2,229	(150)
Daytona Beach	9,271	8,964	307
Edison	4,068	5,412	(1,344)
Fl CC @ Jax	13,156	23,397	(10,241)
Florida Keys	728	850	(122)
Gulf Coast	3,942	3,419	523
Hillsborough	8,578	12,169	(3,591)
Indian River	5,188	7,428	(2,240)
Lake City	2,408	2,438	(30)
Lake Sumter	1,504	1,284	220
Manatee	4,647	5,852	(1,205)
Miami-Dade	21,948	38,043	(16,095)
North Florida	1,106	1,144	(38)
Okal-Walton	3,390	4,019	(629)
Palm Beach	7,957	9,696	(1,739)
Pasco-Hern	2,751	4,461	(1,710)
Pensacola	7,681	9,098	(1,417)
Polk	4,284	4,116	168
St. Johns River	2,203	3,511	(1,308)
St. Petersburg	10,282	12,257	(1,975)
Santa Fe	5,856	9,197	(3,341)
Seminole	5,433	7,828	(2,395)
South Florida	1,940	4,455	(2,515)
Tallahassee	3,828	8,276	(4,448)
Valencia	8,552	12,846	(4,294)
TOTAL	167,191	229,519	(62,328)

Source: State Board of Community Colleges memorandum from William Odum to William Proctor, PEPC, dated December 22, 1989.

TABLE A-9
ACTUAL AND PROJECTED FTE ENROLLMENT LEVELS AT INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN FLORIDA RESPONDING TO PEPC SURVEY

College	Fall 1988 Actual FTE	Fall 1995 Projected FTE	Fall 2000 Projected FTE	Increase 1988-1995	Increase 1995-2000
Barry U.	1,916	2,500	4,500	584	2,000
Clearwater Christian	290	522	650	232	128
Eckerd Col.	1,648	1,850	1,850	202	-0-
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical U.	4,912	5,100	5,200	188	100
Flagler Col.	1,179	1,100	1,100	-79	-0-
Florida Inst. of Technology	3,489	4,200	4,850	711	650
Florida Southern	1,996	2,100	2,150	104	50
Jacksonville University	2,526	3,000	3,000	474	-0-
Nova U.	7,253	14,134	22,763	6,881	8,629
Ringling Sch. of Art & Design	466	600	650	134	50
Rollins Col.	2,573	2,830	3,113	257	283
U. of Miami	13,592	14,117	14,200	525	83
U. of Tampa	2,039	2,500	2,800	461	300
TOTAL	43,879	54,553	66,826	10,674	12,273
Percentage Increase over 1988		24.3%	22.5%		

Source: PEPC Structure Committee survey of independent colleges and universities in Florida, November 1989.

TABLE A-10
FTE ENROLLMENT AT JOINT-USE, SHARED-USE, AND BRANCH CAMPUSES WITHIN FLORIDA

University Affiliation and location	Enrollment 1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89(Est.)
Florida State U.				
Panama City	239	296	356	418
U. of South Florida				
Ft. Myers	364	368	393	411
Sarasota	410	414	456	441
St. Petersburg	1,009	998	996	1,022
Lakeland	---	---	27	121
New College (Sarasota)	360	376	413	456
Florida Atlantic U.				
Commercial Boulevard	486	496	543	557
Downtown	3	88	100	102
Davie	17	17	30	93
U. of West Florida				
Ft. Walton	310	304	356	336
Eglin AFB*	181	178	159	173
U. of Central Florida				
Daytona Beach	167	178	262	268
Brevard	457	480	550	624
South Orlando*	188	190	158	146
Florida Atlantic U.				
Broward	103	203	288	427

* Actually a "center", rather than a "branch campus".

Source: Information supplied by the Planning Office, State University System of Florida.

APPENDIX B. LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

Jack Abstein, President's office, Miami-Dade Community College
Steven Altman, President, University of Central Florida
David Armstrong, State Board of Community Colleges staff
Michael Armstrong, State University System staff
Myrtle Bailey, Governor's staff

James Burnette, Executive Vice President, Edison Community College
Betty Castor, Commissioner of Education
Barbara Cohen, Senate Higher Education staff
Linda Collins, Senate Appropriations staff
Catherine Cornelius, President, South Florida Community College

Lance de Haven-Smith, Provost, FAU-Broward campus
Jeanne Diesen, State Board of Community Colleges staff
Edward Eissey, President, Palm Beach Community College
Abraham Fischler, President, Nova University
Thomas Furlong, Vice President, Tallahassee Community College

Luis Glaser, Provost, University of Miami
Linda Harris, Senate Higher Education staff
Albert Hartley, Executive Vice President, University of South Florida
Terry Hatch, House Appropriations staff
Gene Hemp, Interim Provost, University of Florida

Thomas Henkel, Ass't to President, Valencia Community College
James Hinson, President, Tallahassee Community College
Will Holcombe, President, Broward Community College
Steve Hopkins, House Higher Education staff
Michael Hooks, Vice President, Valencia Community College

Frederick Humphries, President, Florida A&M University
Milton Jones, President, Pasco-Hernando Community College
Terence Kelly, Vice President, Miami-Dade Community College
Maxwell King, President, Brevard Community College
G.G. Meisels, Provost, University of South Florida

Nancy McKee, House Appropriations staff
Roy McTarnaghan, Vice Chancellor, State University System
Glenn Nitschke, Director of Administrative Services, USF-Ft. Myers
William Odum, State Board of Community Colleges staff
Norman Ostrau, State Representative, Broward County

APPENDIX B. LIST OF INTERVIEWEES Continued

Linda Owens, Coordinator, Postsecondary Education, Department of Education
William Proctor, President, Flagler College
Charles Reed, Chancellor, State University System
James Richburg, President, Okaloosa-Walton Junior College
John Ryan, Interim President, Florida Atlantic University

Judith Stiehm, Provost, Florida International University
William Stokes, Vice President, Miami-Dade Community College
Ruth Storm, House Appropriations staff
Betty Tilton, House Higher Education staff
Augustus Turnbull, Provost, Florida State University

Robert Westrick, Director, UCF Joint Center at Brevard
Ed Woodruff, Senate Appropriations staff

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

January 17, 1990

Mr. D. Burke Kibler, Chair
Structure Committee
Postsecondary Education Planning Commission
Florida Education Center
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Dear Mr. Kibler:

Augenblick, Van de Water & Associates (AVA) is pleased to transmit its final report to the PEPC Structure Committee. Our efforts have focused on an examination of Florida's structure for postsecondary education including an analysis of the missions, location, and capacity of existing institutions in light of projected population and enrollment trends over the next ten years.

Florida continues to enjoy an exciting growth environment. Its structure for postsecondary education is essentially sound and, with some alteration, capable of meeting the demands of the coming decade. We recommend several adaptations of the current structure in order to better meet the challenges ahead.

Throughout our work we have been impressed with the quality and commitment of Florida's postsecondary leaders. The PEPC staff was highly responsive to our needs for information as well as thorough and efficient in carrying out the study process. State and campus leaders responded thoughtfully and candidly to our inquiries. Both the interviews and public hearings provided us with important insights into the current structure of higher education in Florida.

We have enjoyed the opportunity to become more familiar with postsecondary education in Florida and hope that our report will be useful to the Structure Committee as it continues its deliberations.

Sincerely,

Gordon Van de Water

Gordon Van de Water

AUGENBLICK, VAN DE WATER & ASSOCIATES
1370 PENNSYLVANIA STREET, SUITE 220 • DENVER, CO 80203 • (303) 832-3444

APPENDIX B

Consultant's Letter on Community College
Governance and Vocational Education

AVA CONSULTANTS TO POLICY AND MANAGEMENT LEADERS IN EDUCATION

February 7, 1990

Dr. William Proctor, Executive Director
Postsecondary Education Planning Commission
Florida Education Center
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0400

Dear Dr. Proctor:

Subsequent to submitting our final report to PEPC's Structure Committee in January, you asked for additional information concerning two issues about which our report was silent.

The first issue related to community college governance. We did review the structure of community colleges and found the current set-up to be good. In our view, as stated in our Interim Report, the current balance between statewide coordination and local responsiveness and flexibility should be retained. We do not support the recommendation made by some in Florida to change the present method of gubernatorial appointment of local board members to an elective system.

The second issue related to vocational education. Our charge specifically excluded vocational education from ~~the study~~. In our interviews with a wide variety of policy leaders in Florida, however, we did offer interviewees the opportunity to identify and discuss issues they felt were important to an understanding of postsecondary governance in Florida. Vocational education did not surface as a prominent issue in those discussions.

I hope this addresses your concerns. If I may be any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

I wish you and the Structure Committee well as you continue to work toward resolution of these issues.

Sincerely,

Gordon Van de Water

Gordon Van de Water

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges MAY 3 1 1990

AUGENBLICK, VAN DE WATER & ASSOCIATES
1370 PENNSYLVANIA STREET, SUITE 220 • DENVER, CO 80203 • (303) 832-3444